

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



101 673

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Intercollegiate Debates

(Volume VI)

A YEAR BOOK OF COLLEGE DEBATING

WITH RECORDS OF QUESTIONS AND DECISIONS,
SPECIMEN SPEECHES AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY — INDIANA UNIVERSITY — FAIRMOUNT
COLLEGE — EUREKA COLLEGE — UNIVERSITIES — FRIENDS —
PHILLIPS — PENNSYLVANIA — COLUMBIA — JAMES MILLIKEN —
ILLINOIS WESLEYAN — SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA — REDLANDS —
HILSDALE COLLEGE — HOPE COLLEGE — AGRICULTURAL COL-
LEGES — COLORADO — KANSAS — OKLAHOMA — CARLETON COL-
LEGE — GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE — HAMLINE COLLEGE

EDITED BY

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS

UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

HINDS, HAYDEN & ELDREDGE, INC., Publishers
NEW YORK CITY

**COPYRIGHT, 1916, BY
HINDS, HAYDEN & ELDREDGE, INC.**

PREFACE

The sixth annual volume of Intercollegiate Debates is presented herewith. In subject matter and general appearance it follows the plan of preceding volumes. A few changes, however, have been made and the volume is smaller in consequence.

Of the changes, the first in order is the omission of Appendix I, which was a list of the debating organizations of the year, Appendix IV, Specimen Debate Contracts and Agreements, and Appendix V, Debaters' Bibliography of Argumentation and Debate. It was felt that it was not desirable to give space to Appendices IV and V every year, and that the addition of a new feature might make Appendix I unnecessary. This additional feature is the second change of note. Appendix III in Volume VI is a table of debate questions of the year showing which institutions discussed them, the character of the debate arrangement and the decision. This table should prove valuable as a supplement to Appendix I, formerly Appendix II, and as a help to individuals who wish to obtain first hand information as to statements of questions, as to bibliography and the respective importance and value of its various items, and as to the selection and presentation of various arguments.

The editor wishes to take this occasion to give credit

PREFACE

to those persons whose ready coöperation has made this volume possible. Their names are given in the introductions to the several debates included.

The reception accorded to previous volumes of this series has been indeed gratifying, and has made the preparation of this volume more of a pleasure than it could otherwise have been.

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS.

University of Redlands,
Redlands, California.

January, 1916.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
I. GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS.	
A. Ohio State University vs. Indiana University. (Dual debate)	1
B. Ohio State Bibliography	67
II. THE MINIMUM WAGE — I.	
A. Friends University vs. Phillips University . . .	73
B. Friends University vs. Fairmount College . . .	99
III. THE MINIMUM WAGE — II.	
A. University of Pennsylvania (Negative) vs. Columbia University	127
B. Pennsylvania University Bibliography	153
IV. THE SINGLE TAX	
A. Eureka College vs. James Milliken University .	161
B. Eureka College vs. Illinois Wesleyan University	179
C. Eureka College Bibliography	197
V. GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF MERCHANT MARINE.	
A. University of Southern California Freshmen vs. University of Redlands	203
B. University of Southern California Bibliography	242
VI. SHIP SUBSIDY.	
A. Hillsdale College vs. Hope College	249
B. Hillsdale College vs. Kalamazoo College	280
C. Hillsdale College Bibliography	312
VII. COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.	
A. Colorado Agricultural College vs. Kansas Agricultural College	319
B. Colorado Agricultural College vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	350
C. Colorado Agricultural College Bibliography . . .	374

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VIII. GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS.	
A. Carleton College vs. Gustavus	383
B. Hamline College vs. Carleton	415
APPENDIX I	
Record of Institutions Engaged in Forensic Contests, Coaches, Questions, Decisions, etc. (Arranged by States)	449
APPENDIX II	
Tables Showing the Results of Debating Contests	508
APPENDIX III	
Record of Questions and Institutions Debating Them	510
INDEX TO THIS VOLUME	523
GENERAL INDEX, VOLUMES I TO VI INCLUSIVE	530

INTRODUCTION

Once again the task of writing an introduction to a volume of debates is before me. There is indeed little to say that is new or that has not been said often enough in the introductions to previous volumes or elsewhere to obviate the necessity of repetition. However, the record of the year can be surveyed, and new subjects for debate, the progress of honor societies, and changes in league alignments, etc., can be noticed. A few words may be added on the reported methods of choosing debaters, and upon the matter of college credits and honors awarded the students who engage in forensic activities.

I. SURVEY OF PAST YEAR IN DEBATE

There was a falling off in the number of reports received from colleges previously listed as institutions annually engaging in debating, but from the reports received one would gain the impression that it was an average year. Discussion was scattered over the usual wide range of subjects, while about six or seven subjects predominated or proved rather exceptionally popular. These subjects were: The Monroe Doctrine (discussed forty-three times), Government Ownership of Railroads (thirty-four times), the Minimum Wage (twenty-five

times), Increase of Army and Navy (twenty-four times), the Independence of the Philippines (twenty-two times), the Single Tax (twenty-one times), and Immigration (fourteen times).

Turning to the introduction written a year ago for Volume V, we find that two of the foregoing subjects, the Minimum Wage and Immigration, stood first for 1913-14, with fifty-seven and forty-one debates to their credit respectively. Furthermore, three of the remaining subjects, the Monroe Doctrine, Government Ownership of the Railroads, and Independence of the Philippines, were popular last year and stood among the first eight with eleven, ten and nineteen discussions respectively. The Single Tax was debated five times in 1913-14; but Increase of the Army and Navy was not debated at all in 1913-14. In fact, four debates were held on the proposition of decreasing the navy. The popularity of increased military and naval preparedness in 1914-15 is from all appearances the direct result of the European War. The popularity of the Monroe Doctrine can be traced in some measure to the interest in foreign relations stimulated by the war. A few scattering debates on such subjects as compulsory military service, colonial expansion, Germany justified in declaring war on Russia, and government ownership of the merchant marine also owe their interest to the war. The forecast as to the effect of the war on intercollegiate debating made in the introduction to Volume V a year ago is, then, pretty well borne out. The revival of interest in the ship subsidy question must be attributed

to the conditions wrought by the war also, showing that some old subjects as well as new questions shared in the hearing awarded the war discussions and their kith and kin.

A. NEW DEBATE SUBJECTS

Among the subjects new to debating last year, which gained in popularity in 1914-15, is Socialism. On the other hand a subject, which appeared to have marks of increasing popularity in 1913-14, Woman Suffrage, was dropped completely from discussion as far as the reports received show. Intervention and Mexican affairs did not attract debates as it was predicted they might, largely because debaters feared that a settlement of the questions involved would at any moment ruin such topics for debate. Just such a fear is this year in many instances driving discussions of increased military preparedness off the schedule. The effect on a debate proposition of action by Congress is too often a death blow for college men to take the risk.

A noticeable thing about the debating year of 1914-15 is that no subjects attained the high water mark of popularity reached by the Minimum Wage in 1913-14 with its fifty-seven discussions. In fact, the leading subject this year exceeds the second place debate proposition last year by only two debates as they stand forty-three to forty-one, a record considerably less than that of the Minimum Wage.

Of the subjects which are new that will be debated in 1915-16 Socialism, the City-manager Plan, Military

Preparedness, Government Ownership of the Merchant Marine, Federal Control of Marriage and Divorce, and Exemption of Labor Unions from Anti-trust Legislation should be mentioned. It is impossible of course to forecast the trend of popularity in debate subjects, but there seems to be no reason why the popular questions of 1914-15, for instance, the Monroe Doctrine, Government Ownership of Railroads, the Independence of the Philippines, and the Single Tax, should not continue to be debated. The Minimum Wage may have run its course, and Immigration may lose its hold because of the cessation of the stream of foreigners to our shores during the great war. Governmental and political subjects should have an opportunity to come back now that the interest in foreign affairs is abating, a presidential campaign approaching, and social and economic reforms are not so insistent.

B. DEBATING ORGANIZATIONS

A noticeable feature of the year is the reappearance of quadrangular and pentangular leagues. The Minnesota pentangular was a one year arrangement and disappears into various triangulars. A new pentangular league will appear among Kansas Colleges to take its place. This new pentangular will introduce a new custom, that of each member of the organization meeting all of the others in one year. The debates will be held in sets of twos as if each institution were in two triangulars, and will be held about two weeks apart. The subject to be discussed is the Monroe Doctrine. A new quadrangular

league appeared this year among Texas colleges, and another among Ohio institutions. This is significant as this form of league has not been in vogue of recent years, the one in Pennsylvania being the sole survivor.

C. TENDENCIES IN DEBATING

The tendency marked in previous years for long trips has not abated, but continues a striking characteristic of present day debating. In many instances the members of leagues are located in different states and are many hundred miles distant from one another. The tendency for institutions of the same class to draw together in debate relations is as prominent as last year. The tendency to increase the number of debates at each institution, or to encourage the retention of a large schedule is marked. The number of debates scheduled last year by such institutions as the University of Southern California, Kansas State Agricultural College, Huron College (S. Dakota), and Macalester College (Minnesota) is rather remarkable. This particular tendency has been discussed, however, as fully as necessary in a previous introduction. The participation of college women in debates solely for women instead of in competition with men is gaining slowly. Such debates have been held for a number of years in Kansas, Iowa and Washington. California has joined the ranks now, and other "suffrage" states should follow.

Two innovations that should not pass without notice have to do with the judging of debates. The single judge idea has struck Kansas and was "tried out" in

several debates with apparent success and satisfaction. In Ohio the original triangular league or rather the founders of the triangle plan evolved the idea of holding debates without having any decision at all. This is a change of such radical nature that it will probably not gain adherents rapidly. It removes a part of the charm and zest that is more or less essential to an intercollegiate activity, and leaves all the training value of a debate intact. However, we do not need intercollegiate debates for a training which can be gained in intra-collegiate forensic activity. If we are not seeking struggle and contest, and worthy foemen why hold intercollegiate debates? On the other hand, see how much of strain, of pre-contest bickering, and of the evils arising from an inordinate desire to win at all hazards is eliminated. Again, a new idea bound to come no doubt in this matter of debate decisions is the popular vote of the audience when debates are held on mutual ground or at a third institution.

2. INFLUENCES IN COLLEGE DEBATING. A. METHODS OF CHOOSING DEBATERS

A question has been carried on the blanks that are sent out annually for the debate reports designed to elicit information as to methods of choosing debaters. The question has not been well stated hence a compilation of the replies has not been of much practical value. The results are given for what they are worth. The primary contest is the most popular of all methods used in choosing debaters, seventy-one institutions reporting this

method in vogue. Twenty-two other institutions report that coaches choose in conjunction with a primary contest. Six institutions report that a committee of the faculty chooses the intercollegiate debaters but do not say whether or not they use a contest in so doing. Eight institutions choose their debaters in primary contests within literary societies; three allow the coach to make the choice in the literary societies; and in three others the society chooses. Three institutions leave the choice of debaters solely to coaches. It is evident from these statistics that a contest of some kind is usually employed and that debaters are seldom chosen or elected without first demonstrating their right to places on the teams by defeating other contestants.

B. THE LITERARY SOCIETY

The influence of the literary society seems to have waned somewhat since the first volume of *Intercollegiate Debates* was issued, and not so many debaters are chosen in those organizations. How great a factor the literary society is in intercollegiate debating at the present time is hard to determine, as many institutions which report other methods use literary societies and their frequent debates as training schools for future intercollegiate representatives. On the other hand a growing number of colleges do not have literary societies. It is an undisputed fact that the literary society is losing ground in American colleges. It is no longer the popular accompaniment of student life that it once was. It is losing its power to pre-empt Friday evening, for the automobile,

the dance, and the "movies" have stolen its place in the hearts of the rising college generations. Yet, despite this drawback, intercollegiate debating has increased in popularity, a fact which seems to indicate that the literary interest which once existed in the form of society organization is after all still extant and is now dispersed among specialized collegiate activities such as oratory, debating, dramatics, and the college papers and magazines, all of which have undoubtedly increased their hold of recent years on college men and women.

C. THE COACH AND CLASS ROOM WORK

The influence of the coach and of the teacher of Public Speaking is another factor which enters the situation and undoubtedly affects the popularity of forensics more or less. The coöperation and intelligent interest of a member of the faculty is a considerable stimulus to the forensic activities. Many institutions do not have a coaching system either because of a lack of funds to employ a member of the faculty for this purpose or from an objection arising as to "the principle of the thing." That the presence of a professional coach indicates a strong desire to win is undoubtedly true—but what is wrong with that? Obviously nothing unless the victory is gained by unfair methods. This is a subject, a controversy, perhaps—into which we may not enter at this time. There is much to be said for and against the coaching system—that is why the public speaking world is divided over the proposition. However, even in the institutions where a system of coaching is disavowed

some member of the faculty usually has charge and oversees the activity giving suggestions of more or less value to the men on the teams. The students desire and appreciate this encouragement, and in some institutions the demand for the professional coach has been so insistent that departments of Public Speaking have been added in order that training may have a definite basis and may be given in class room work. In some cases the professor of public speaking becomes a coach and in many cases he does not. The local conditions at each institution determine the amount of extra coaching aside from class work that is necessary.

The influence of the class room work on debating has undoubtedly been great of recent years. Where the students present the real atmosphere of work and a real desire to acquire the difficult art of public speaking, the class room is the ideal training ground for the inter-collegiate debater. This is recognized everywhere and an increasing number of institutions are offering work in argumentation and the various branches of public speaking and this has undoubtedly increased forensic activity and improved its quality.

D. COLLEGE CREDITS FOR DEBATING

Another factor which must be considered because of its influence on debating is the college credit derived from participation in such events. A poll was taken of several institutions last year on the question, "Does your college give credit for work in debates?" It is to be regretted that this poll is incomplete for the replies that were re-

ceived are illuminating and suggest that a complete report would be quite so. Fifty-six institutions report that some credit is given, thirty-three that no credit is given, two that credit has been given but is not now and will not be in the future, and one reports that a letter is awarded as in athletic contests. It is undoubtedly true that many other institutions grant letters and medals for membership on intercollegiate teams, and one institution is offering tuition and half tuition scholarships for men winning the right to represent the "varsity" in intercollegiate forensics.

Of the fifty-six colleges reporting credit given, six state that the credit is given in connection with class room work. Of those reporting no credit, some must beyond doubt have courses in the curriculum in which credit is given for argumentative work whether or not the intercollegiate debates are considered a part of this work. Of the fifty colleges and universities that give credit outright for debating, five report one hour of credit a semester or term, one reports an hour and a half, eight give two hours, five donate three hours (one institution reducing the amount to two hours if it is the student's second intercollegiate debate), and one gives four hours. Thirty institutions merely answered "yes" to the inquiry stated above.

Now what is the significance of the credit situation in debate? There is much to be said if time and space permitted. Is the college credit a compensation or reward to the student for sacrificing grades in his studies to serve his alma mater in a college enterprise? This manifestly

is the ground of the honor society, and of the award of a letter or medal. Again, is the college credit a bait to attract the capable men who might not otherwise compete? Again, is the college credit given reluctantly by faculties to appease the demand of the ever credit hungry student who is sometimes unwilling to do anything which gives no return to self? If this is the case, are we doing right educationally to accustom the student to receive emoluments for public or community service which should be given gratis and without thought of reward? Are we giving our country those public spirited and self-sacrificing citizens that our political and social welfare demands? Or are we turning out a group of calculating, designing individuals trained to prey on the public service like those political harpies who have nearly ruined politics and governmental service in the past? It is just a matter of ideals, of course, and these remarks apply beyond the debating activity in college enterprises. A close scrutiny into the matter of giving credits for intercollegiate activities of any kind arouses grave doubts on the part of the investigator as to the appropriateness and good judgment of such action. There is a growing consciousness that this sort of credit giving is not good pedagogy when such credits are used to fulfill the requirements of graduation no matter how thorough and valuable may be the training received in debate or in other enterprises by the student. A considerable number of faculties have resolved, and the editor believes rightfully, that no credits shall be given for college debates or any other college enterprises except as such enterprises become a recognized

and legitimate part of a course scheduled properly in the curriculum. That students respect and honor this point of view is undoubtedly true, when the point of view is explained to them. Students are opposed to any lowering of the standard behind the diploma, and realize keenly also the viciousness of the "what-is-there-in-it-for-me" attitude toward college enterprises. When the connection of this disagreeable and selfish spirit to the "donate-me-a-credit" propaganda is pointed out they are perfectly willing to turn from the system. That the giving of college credits for college enterprises well performed is ever vicious and harms all recipients, I do not mean for a moment to imply. Most certainly there are many instances and situations where such a course is fair and just and above criticism, but as a general rule it is a "custom more honored in the breach than the observance." The idea behind it is not sound. If credit is to be given let it be given in connection with regular class room, collegiate work.

The better method of recompensing the student for his loyalty and devotion to the alma mater in engaging in college enterprises is the awarding of letters, medals, athletic regalia, membership in honor societies, and honorary keys and emblems. Perhaps the honor society is the most practicable in the field of intercollegiate forensics for many institutions, the granting of medals and letters for others.

E. HONORARY FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS

That the award of such honors is a valuable influence upon intercollegiate debating is surely true. Systems of awarding letters and medals are easily devised. Knowledge of the forensic organizations is not so common. For that reason a short sketch of those in the field known to the editor exclusive of purely local organizations is appended here.

Since mention of honorary forensic societies was made in a previous introduction to a volume in this series there has been considerable progress and development in this special domain of Greek letter activity. The idea of recognizing participants in forensic events by conferring membership in an honorary society has proved popular. New societies have arisen and those first in the field have added many new chapters. The three foremost organizations of this nature, Delta Sigma Rho, Tau Kappa Alpha, and Pi Kappa Delta, are holding national conventions and issuing periodicals devoted to the advancement of the honor society cause. Delta Sigma Rho has issued a magazine, *The Gavel*, for a number of years and is quite firmly established as the first and largest organization of the kind. Within the last year and within a few weeks of each other Tau Kappa Alpha and Pi Kappa Delta initiated *The Speaker* and *The Forensic*, respectively.

Delta Sigma Rho, as stated above, was the first organization for forensic men and was inaugurated by a group of university debaters meeting at Chicago, Illinois, in April, 1906. A movement looking toward this or-

ganization and which finally resulted in it was begun previously by the professors of public speaking at the state universities of Iowa and Minnesota. From the beginning Delta Sigma Rho has been composed largely of university men and has located most of its chapters in the large universities. It has, however, entered a few colleges, as Beloit, Carleton, Swarthmore, Iowa Teachers' and Albion. Generally speaking, though, it may be called the "university honorary society." It is organized on a local chapter basis and holds a national convention annually. Delta Sigma Rho has nearly fifty chapters at the present time.

Tau Kappa Alpha was the second Greek Letter forensic organization. It originated at Butler College, Indianapolis, Indiana, in 1908. A meeting of delegates from Butler, Wabash, and DePauw (all of Indiana) assembled in the office of Lieut. Governor Hugh Th. Miller and formed a state chapter. Ohio was invaded and later other states. Recently the state chapter idea was abandoned and all institutions associated in state chapters were given local charters and Tau Kappa Alpha is now expanding upon a local chapter basis. The organization now has twenty-six chapters located in colleges and universities throughout the country. Tau Kappa Alpha has sought the large institution and has entered several universities where Delta Sigma Rho was already located, in some cases confining itself to the law schools of these institutions.

Phi Alpha Tau was the third organization in the field. It began at the Emerson College of Expression in Boston and has entered about five other institutions, two of them

state universities in the Middle West where Delta Sigma Rho had already entered. The special distinction of Phi Alpha Tau is that it initiates students achieving honors in college dramatics as well as debating and oratory. It is an "Expression" organization, and has the further distinction of a pin or fraternity badge whereas all the others have adopted honorary keys.

Pi Kappa Delta, the youngest of the four, was organized in 1913 by a group of college men in Kansas working in conjunction with another group in Wisconsin. It is organized on a different plan from the others having local chapters, and state and national chapter organizations over them. It has degrees to accompany the local, state and national chapters. A debater or orator may advance from one degree to the other and may receive an additional or special distinction in the third degree, or the national chapter. The organization divides its members into orders and classes, the orders being, oratory, debate, and instruction, and the classes, active, inactive, graduate, and honorary. Pi Kappa Delta has the special distinction of jewelling its key to designate the various degrees and orders of members. Another distinction of the organization is that it has not as yet entered any state universities, having been organized primarily as a college honor society. Pi Kappa Delta has fourteen chapters at the present time.

Among the Michigan colleges a state forensic honor society, Phi Beta Sigma, was organized in 1915. It comprises practically all of the colleges in Michigan engaged in forensic activity. Whether it is to be a state organiza-

tion with or without local chapters remains to be seen. The intention at first was to make it a national organization but this idea may be abandoned because of the fact that there are already four in the field which would seem to be enough for the present at least.

Two organizations have appeared among college women engaged in forensic activities, Zeta Kappa Xi at Kansas State Agricultural College and Delta Phi at Washington University, Seattle. The former was organized in 1913 but has remained a local organization. The latter was organized in 1915 and has extended to Washington State College at Pullman. California and Iowa are open as fields for extension as college women hold debates in these states. With such a limited field one organization would doubtless suffice and might by its strength serve as a stimulus to forensic activity among college women. Again the distance to be overcome for national gatherings argues the advisability of two separate and distinct organizations.

The local honor organizations at various institutions will doubtless find their way gradually into the organizations now in the national field, and in a few years as great a change as that noted during the past few years may take place.

Having raised some questions and made some suggestions concerning forensic activities, an editor's duty as far as this particular introduction is concerned may be said to be performed.

**GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF
TELEGRAPH AND TELE-
PHONE SYSTEMS**

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELE- PHONE SYSTEMS

*OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY vs. INDIANA
UNIVERSITY*

When the University of Illinois withdrew from the triangular league with the state universities of Ohio and Indiana these two institutions were left to battle each other in a dual debate. They met at both universities on the evening of March 12, 1915, the affirmative debating on the home floor. Ohio State was victorious in each debate by unanimous decisions.

The Telegraph-Telephone question is one of rising importance in the debating world, having been extremely popular in the interscholastic field. Many colleges and universities have turned their attention to it recently and have found it one of the best of the Government Ownership questions.

The statement used by Ohio and Indiana was
Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate the telephone and telegraph systems in the United States.

The following speeches were collected and submitted for inclusion in the present volume by Mr. V. A. Ketcham, Assistant Professor in Ohio State University in charge of debating, and author of a work, "Argumentation and Debate," recently issued by The Macmillan Company.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELE- PHONE SYSTEMS

*OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY vs. INDIANA
UNIVERSITY*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, L. L. RUMMELL, OHIO STATE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Government ownership has been a very important question in this country since 1843 when \$30,000 was appropriated by Congress for the control and operation of the first electric telegraph. Since that time it has been indorsed by nearly every postmaster-general, with a score of favorable reports by committees in Congress, and by the example of nearly every other nation in the world. So important is this question, therefore, that we come before you this evening to discuss whether government ownership is preferable to our present system of private ownership subject to state and federal supervision.

The founders of our nation saw clearly that all means of communication should be kept under federal control. They provided that Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads. It was their intention that future generations should use such inventions or

improvements as railway postal cars, canceling machines, pneumatic tubes, telegraphs and telephones. The telegraph and the telephone are inseparably connected and in this discussion we must consider them together.

In the analysis of this question we believe that there are but three main issues: (1) whether government ownership is necessary; (2) whether there are feasible plans for the acquisition of these lines by the government; and (3) whether government ownership after the acquisition of these lines would be practicable in operation. It shall be the object of the affirmative in this debate to prove that government ownership is necessary because rates are exorbitant and service is restricted; and that it is a natural postal function of our government to own these lines. We shall also show that there are feasible plans for the acquisition of these lines by the government; and furthermore, that such a system as we propose will be practicable in operation.

As we investigate our present system we find many undesirable features which government ownership would eliminate. For example, we see the common fault of duplication of lines and service. New inventions, such as the multiplex whereby twelve telegrams can be sent over one wire at the same time, are not used by these private monopolies. The operators are not the most efficient because few of them ever expect to remain in this service any length of time. Then there is the enormous and wasteful expense of influencing legislation to keep down the rising sentiment in favor of government ownership. Yet in spite of these undesirable features, we wish to be

fair with the gentlemen of the negative and we shall not quibble over such small matters. Each of us recognizes that from an engineering viewpoint our present system has met our needs in a limited way, especially in the large cities. But we hold that government ownership will result in lower rates and a far more extensive service, and at the same time we shall retain the desirable features of our present system.

In the first place government ownership is necessary because it is the only means whereby we can realize the full advantage of the telegraph and the telephone. Both of them are indispensable instruments of business and social intercourse. The farmer needs the telephone to reach the city; the producer to reach the consumer; the resident in the outlying district to reach the physician. Certainly all things should be done to make this service available to every one regardless of social rank or place of residence, just as is now done with our postal department.

Moreover, the telegraph and telephone monopolies are commanding exorbitant rates and government ownership is necessary in order to reduce them. For example, we pay a minimum charge of twenty-five cents to send a telegram of ten words and two cents for each additional word, while in Germany, Great Britain, and New Zealand under government ownership it costs but twelve cents; and in France, Belgium, and Norway under government ownership, but ten cents to send a telegram of twenty words and one-half cent for each additional word. Prof. Richard T. Ely, of the University of Wisconsin, has

said that distance has but little to do with the cost of sending a telegram. And so we find that in practically every other country this uniform price is charged. Yet in the United States it costs us twenty-five cents to send a telegram from New York to Boston, fifty cents to Chicago, seventy-five cents to Denver, and one dollar to San Francisco. Thus we see in comparison with the European that these American monopolies are making two hundred per cent. profits by deceiving the people in regard to the amount of difference that distance makes. Honorable Judges, such rates, two to ten times normal, are far too great a price to pay for this privilege of neglecting to discharge fully our natural postal functions.

In the case of long distance telephone calls rates are even more exorbitant than the telegraph charges. Thus in the United States it costs us sixty cents to telephone one hundred miles while in Germany and Great Britain under government ownership it costs but twenty-four cents, in France ten cents, and in Sweden eight cents. These comparative differences increase with the distance until we find that in Germany one can telephone seven hundred miles for forty-eight cents, in Sweden for thirty-four cents, and in the United States for \$4.20. Then, again, we can send a letter and receive a reply cheaper than we can call a person by local telephone. With the exception of Japan our postal rates are the lowest, but our telephone and telegraph rates are the highest in the world.

An independent telephone company starting in Cleveland operated for \$36 and \$48 against the Bell's \$60 and

\$84. Another independent company here in Columbus caused the Bell within four years to reduce its rates from \$48 and \$96 to \$42 and \$72. In the gentlemen's own city of Indianapolis an independent telephone company operated for \$24 and \$40 at the time when the Bell was demanding \$48 and \$72. We find similar instances in Rochester, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Grand Rapids, and many other cities because these monopolies are free to command such exorbitant rates.

Naturally they have always reaped enormous profits. Postmaster Wanamaker's Report in 1892 shows that in 1874 the Western Union Telegraph Company returned 414 per cent. dividends. From 1858 to 1890 their cash dividends averaged 300 per cent. per year. From 1900 to 1907 their net earnings have amounted to more than \$7,300,000 annually. The Bell Telephone Company in 1913 according to its own report returned \$59,000,000.

These excessive profits are even larger than they appear when we consider the amount of watered stock in these companies. As an instance of watered stock let us look at the line built between Brownsville, Nebraska, and Salt Lake City. This line cost about \$75,000. It was capitalized at \$147,000, but the stock issued by the Pacific Telegraph Company amounted to \$1,000,000. Later this line was taken over by the Western Union and stock issued for \$2,000,000 which was later trebled; so that the original \$75,000 came to represent \$6,000,000 of Western Union stock.

This line was paid for three times over by a bonus of

\$400,000 from the United States Government, which added to our \$6,000,000 shows that this stock had eighty-four parts water to one of solid.

The 1902 Report of the United States Industrial Commission shows that in 1893 the capitalization of the Western Union averaged \$645 per mile. That same year this company brought suit to enjoin the State of Ohio from assessing it about \$240, declaring the lines cost but \$103 and were actually worth only \$78 per mile. Thus we see that the people were paying interest on lines worth only \$78 but capitalized at \$645 — or at least eight times their actual value.

Furthermore, we see that the Western Union can operate with less profit, for in order to compete with the Baltimore and Ohio they did cut their rate to ten cents between New York and any point from Maine to Washington, D. C. According to D. H. Bates, the manager of the Baltimore and Ohio, that company made a profit on the business. The Western Union has carried press messages at the rate of six and one-half cents per hundred words.

The possibilities of reducing rates by government ownership is exemplified in our parcel post system. At the adoption of this system the old express rate of twenty-five cents was reduced to six cents. After the system was in operation for one year it was found that a profit was being made. Immediately the weight limit was increased and rates reduced. The postmaster-general administered the parcel post law in the interests of the people and not for profit.

We see, therefore, by government statistics that the rates in the United States are higher than those in Europe, that these companies are reaping enormous profits even on watered stock, and that this service can be given at less cost. In view of these facts we hold that the rates are exorbitant and that government ownership is necessary in order to reduce them.

Furthermore, government ownership is necessary in order to extend our present telephone and telegraph systems. The private monopoly has no incentive to extend its facilities to unprofitable territory. It builds only where the traffic will be large and leaves the thinly settled portions of our country with little or no service. The government, on the other hand, serves all the people. The policy at all times is universal service which is merely self supporting. Private monopoly on the contrary extends its facilities only as the service performed insures substantial dividends to its stockholders.

The small number of people in the United States accommodated by the telegraph is shown by the fact that in 1912 there was barely one message per capita; while in New Zealand under government control there were more than eight. In England between 1869 and 1900 under government ownership the number of messages increased thirteen fold or nearly twice the increase in the United States, although our increase in population was three and one-third times that of England. This shows that the addition of the telegraph and the telephone to our postal department, as in England, would result in an extension of these facilities to the masses.

Therefore, Honorable Judges, because the rates now charged by the telegraph and telephone companies are exorbitant; because the service now given by these companies is restricted to classes and regions; and because government ownership is the only means whereby we can realize the full advantage of the telegraph and telephone, we hold that government ownership is necessary and ask that you support this resolution.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, FRANK WATSON, OHIO STATE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker on the affirmative has stated that the evils—"Exorbitant Rates and Restricted Service" exist in the present system. He has pointed out the necessity of government ownership and operation in order to do away with these evils and has shown that this remedy was early anticipated by the founders of this nation. I shall show that the principle of government ownership, in so far as it applies to the transmission of intelligence, is sound.

Telegraph and telephone facilities are natural postal functions. This function originates in the Constitution, which makes the federal government the agent for transmitting intelligence. The Constitution gives Congress the power to establish post-offices and post-roads. When the use of steam was discovered the government did away with the post-horse in the mail service. It immediately adopted the more efficient method. Since that time a still more efficient method has been found and we are pleading for its adoption. The Supreme Court interprets power, "The transmission of intelligence in any form."

It declares that a telegram or a telephone call is a letter sent by wire. Now, we want the government to adopt this more efficient method. We want our correspondence sent by electricity because the superiority of electrical over other means of communication has long been established. Such a step would be in accord with our most advanced government practices. There is a growing feeling in our country that when private enterprise does not satisfactorily conduct public utilities, and those utilities are monopolistic in character, the government should own and operate them.

The telegraph and telephone business is appropriate and ripe for government ownership because it is monopolistic and not competitive in nature. It is better to be a subscriber to a single system with 15,000 subscribers, than a member of one of three systems each of which has 5,000 subscribers. Even Theodore N. Vail, president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, urges the need of systematic unity. He says: "In order to render the most efficient service it must be monopolistic." The telephone and telegraph are monopolies tending to a single monopoly because the Bell and Western Union are the sole survivors, except former lines and useless duplications. According to the report of the United States Investigating Committee, ninety per cent. of the telephones of this country are owned by or connected with the Bell Company. They even have the same executive management in Theodore Vail.

Under private ownership no marked extension of the service can ever be made, because the telephone is a util-

ity of increasing costs. As Professor Seager, of the economics department of Columbia University, and Professor Taussig, of the economics department of Harvard University, point out the number of subscribers increases arithmetically, while the cost of operation increases geometrically. When the place of saturation in any particular community is reached it becomes less profitable for the company to add a new subscriber than to invest capital in other fields. Consequently, expansion immediately stops. This clearly shows that we cannot rely on any company, which has profit as its motive, to extend the telephone service.

The gentlemen from Indiana are defending this monopoly as it is. We are defending this monopoly as we think it should be. The question is one of ownership and operation. Who should own and operate this monopoly?

Let us compare the best examples of public and private monopoly of which we know. We believe in the postal service because it is efficient. But who trusts private enterprise so far that he would like to see the mail service turned over to a private monopoly—for instance the American Telephone and Telegraph Company? Private business is managed in order to secure a profit, and, other things being equal, the higher the price secured for any service the greater will be the profit. The rule of private financing, therefore, is to maintain the price of goods or services at the point where profit will be the greatest. The rule of public financing, on the other hand, conforms to an altogether different principle. It is the pur-

Text

two-thirds, while in that of the telegraph the service efficiency was lowered one-half.

Before we consider any plan for the acquisition of these systems we want it thoroughly understood that we are not advocating the details of any plan. The details of acquisition are to be left entirely to Congress. But to show you that the measure is feasible we are willing to suggest several possible plans. First, we can buy the existing systems at duplication cost. England bought her lines. Second, we can build the lines new and complete. The advantage in this would be that we would have new equipment with which to begin business. France, Holland and Australia built their lines. In 1890 a syndicate of capitalists went to Postmaster-general Wanamaker and offered to build the lines new and complete and then turn them over to the government. The government was to repay these capitalists from the proceeds of the service and an additional one cent per message until the lines were paid for.

It does not make any difference how we are to do it; the means are not lacking. Our country is the most prosperous in the world and acquisition cost would be relatively small. According to the testimony of the Western Union, in State vs. Jones, as reported in Ohio State -492, and in Adams Express Company vs. Ohio, as reported in 165 United States, their property cost \$103 and was actually worth only \$78 per mile. From their own figures we find that their property is not worth as much and would not cost as much as the gentlemen would have you believe. Treasury notes or long time bonds could be

issued with which to pay for the equipment. We must not overlook the fact that our income is constant after acquisition and the income from this new source of national revenue could reasonably be expected to pay for the indebtedness.

If fifty-three nations of the world can buy their telegraph and telephone lines and pay for them, then the problem of acquisition should not bother us. Our own postal system was not profitable until it adopted the parcel post.

Finally, the expansive development of the postoffice demands that the telephone and telegraph systems be acquired by the government. Postmaster-general Burleson's report to the Senate gives us information on this point. We have a uniform two cent letter rate to all parts of the country. Rural free delivery connects every corner of the land. Parcel post has been established and the government is now establishing federal employing agencies within the scope of the postoffice.

Now, since we have shown there is need of government ownership because of exorbitant rates and restricted service; since we have pointed out that the basic principle underlying government ownership is sound; and that there are feasible plans for the acquisition of these systems, we maintain that the federal government should own and operate the telephone and telegraph systems in the United States.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, ARTHUR S. BURKETT, OHIO STATE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have just been told that seventy per cent. of the telephone develop-

ment of the world is in the United States and that there is not much of a system outside of the United States. We have just heard the comparison of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and whole countries in Europe. That is the very reason why we are to-night advocating government ownership. There is not much of a system in the United States itself if you leave out the large cities which the gentlemen mention. The United States Bureau of Census reports that there are only eight and three-fourths million telephones in the United States, almost one million or one-tenth of these are in New York alone, almost the same number in Illinois, two-thirds of a million are in Pennsylvania, two-thirds of a million in Ohio, 400,000 in Missouri, almost 400,000 in Iowa and 350,000 in Indiana. Fifty per cent. of the entire development is in these seven states alone, leaving the other forty-one states scarcely supplied. For these reasons we have already pointed out that government ownership of the telegraph and telephone is necessary.

We also pointed out that the proportion was based on sound economic principles and that there are feasible plans for the acquisition of the systems by the government. It remains now only to consider the question of whether the federal government could successfully operate the systems after acquisition.

The resolution to-night, you will note, provides for the acquisition of both the telegraph and telephone. This is because the two are inextricably combined and must be kept together. Telegrams are now delivered over the telephone because it is cheaper and quicker than mes-

senger service. Science has demonstrated that three telephone communications and seven telegrams can be sent simultaneously over the same two wires that to-day carry telephone messages alone. The unification of systems would thus save the enormous cost of parallel lines, duplicate stations, offices, and management. To-day many of the long distance telephone lines owned by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company carry both telephone and telegraph messages simultaneously. In Europe under government ownership this unification of systems is practically complete.

That American enterprise clearly foresees the benefits of such a combined system is strikingly illustrated by the fact that when the Western Union was about to add the telephone to its service the Bell telephone interests bought the Western Union, and to-day the two are but arms of a great monopoly, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. To-day in 1200 rural communities and 1500 towns and cities, the telegraph and telephone offices are operated together. So inextricably are the two combined that the court of last resort of Great Britain has decided that a telephone is a telegraph, that a conversation by telephone is a telegram, and that under an act providing for the acquisition of telegraph lines, the government could also acquire telephone lines. The telegraph and telephone must be kept together.

That government ownership of the telegraph and telephone is practicable, is shown by the fact that it is practically the universal rule of nations to-day. No system unless practicable would have extended so rapidly, so uni-

versally, and endured every trial so consistently, as government ownership of the telegraph and telephone. Fifty-three nations to-day own their telegraph systems, thirty-three both telegraph and telephone. No nation adopting government ownership has ever repealed it, but on the contrary its application is rapidly extending. The United States, the nation which established government ownership by building the first telegraph line on taxpayers' money, is left to the company of Cyprus, Hawaii, and Honduras. All the leading nations of the world have government ownership. Their experience has demonstrated its practicability.

Government ownership decreases rates. The local telephone rates show that the Bell system receives \$1.86 for 100 local calls. The average for the nations having government ownership is but ninety-three cents, one-half as much. Under government ownership the telephone rate for a local call in Japan is four mills, in Norway six, and Russia six and one-half. Subscribers' rates for American cities compared to European cities of the same class show that in each instance we must pay at least three times as much as the cities of Europe. The business rate of New York City alone often exceeds the combined business rates of London, Paris, Berlin and Stockholm.

The long distance telephone rates show the same disproportion. The average European continental rate for a twenty-five mile call under government ownership is eight cents. Our Bell rate is twenty-five cents. For a 100 mile call the European government rate is twenty cents. Our Bell rate is sixty cents. The disproportion

increases with distance until when the distance is 700 miles, the European government rate is but fifty-three cents, the Bell rate \$4.20. European governments have fixed the rates at one-third to one-eighth of American private monopoly rates.

The same is true of the telegraph rates. Under government ownership the average receipt for a telegram, counting address and signature as separate words, in France is but thirteen cents, in Japan twelve, and in Switzerland thirteen. And the average of the nations having government ownership is but ten to fifteen cents for a ten to fifteen word telegram. The Western Union rate is twenty-five cents to \$1.00 for a ten word message and two to seven cents for each additional word. Government ownership rates are two-fifths to one-tenth of American private monopoly rates.

This decrease in rates under government ownership has meant an increase in service. Experience shows that users vary universally with rate. The higher the rate, the less is the amount of service performed. The lower the rate, the greater is the volume of business. When the British postoffice, under a government system, in 1885 reduced its telegraph rate from twenty-four to twelve cents, it increased service sixty per cent. When Switzerland and Belgium cut rates in half, service doubled. When Prussia cut rates thirty-three per cent., service increased seventy per cent. When France announced a thirty-five per cent. reduction in rates, service increased sixty-four per cent.

So we find that while in America under private owner-

ship there is only one telegram per capita annually, in New Zealand, under government ownership there are eight. While in America, under private ownership, there are less than two long distance telephone calls per capita annually, under government ownership in Switzerland there are four, in Germany seven, and in Luxemburg there are nine. While in the United States under private ownership there are but 48 local telephone calls per capita annually, under government ownership in Germany there are 301 and in Denmark 761.

Government ownership has not only increased service by decreasing rates, it has also extended service points. In England under private ownership, the main centers of commerce and population were served, but smaller and more remote districts were for the most part ignored even though in many cases wires passed right through their limits. When government ownership was established, during the first year the number of stations more than doubled. In short, government ownership abroad has decreased rates, extended connection points, and increased service.

We need not rely solely on foreign experience to determine the practicability of this measure. The United States Government itself to-day owns and operates gigantic and intricate telegraph and cable systems and operates them efficiently.

To show that government ownership has failed in operation the last gentleman from Indiana has told you that the United States Government itself abandoned the measure in 1846 after three years of unsuccessful opera-

tion. But the federal government relinquished its ownership before the measure had been given a fair trial, and it did so then not because the postmaster-general had failed to operate the system efficiently, as the gentleman asserted, but because of the postal deficit then existing and the reluctance of Congress to extend the postal facilities. But the federal government has returned to its former policy, recalled its last grants by the passage of the telegraph act, and has established government ownership in our outlying possessions.

One of these systems is the Washington-Alaska system, which connects the states with the Alaskan coast, the Yukon Valley and the region about the Bering Strait. The federal government erected the northern part of this line through a veritable wilderness, where the snow lay sixty feet on the level and the temperature fell to 100 degrees below zero. It laid down 1000 miles of ocean cable between Sitka and Seattle to give American citizens in the most remote district the benefits of instantaneous communication with the states. And when icebergs ground this cable in two the gap was bridged by wireless, the only one operated as a part of a commercial telegraph system.

The United States government built and operates telegraph and telephone lines in the Philippines. It extended one section through such a wild and tractless region that not one of the pioneer linemen could continue with the work until completion because of the climatic conditions. Seven thousand miles of land lines and 1,500 miles of cable were laid down. Then the government built twenty-

four telephone systems in the Philippine Archipelago and put them in charge of the postal department.

The United States Government built and operates the telegraph and telephone systems in Porto Rico. The smallest and most remote towns of the island are connected with telegraph stations through the medium of the telephone. And if the federal government could successfully operate systems under such disadvantageous conditions as exist in Alaska and the Philippines, why could it not successfully operate systems under the favorable conditions existing in the states themselves.

The systems when taken over will be self-supporting. The increase in business will keep pace with the reduction in rates until exceedingly low rates can be reached. This large volume of business at a small rate will mean financial success just as much as the small amount of business at the high rate does to-day. This has been the experience of other nations.

But without regard to what the next speaker may tell you, we ask you not to consider the financial side of the question too strongly in forming your opinion of the policy of government ownership of the telegraph and telephone. This problem is a social one and not solely one of dollars and cents.

Public schools, colleges, universities, and experiment stations are maintained at the expense of the taxpayers whether they individually are the systems or not. We maintain rural free delivery of postal matter, even though of necessity it must entail a deficit because the results

of a freer inter-communication of people, measured in terms of social welfare, national progress and prosperity will more than counter-balance the expenditure of money we make. And it is just as much the duty of the government now to join together the distant branches of our nation, and to make available to every one the most powerful means of communication known to-day, because the benefit of universal service at low rates, measured in terms of social welfare, national progress, and prosperity will more than counterbalance a possible postal deficit, the existence of which is as yet purely a speculation on the part of the negative.

The time has come to make the change to government ownership. The success of the government in dealing with the telephone and telegraph problem in our possessions, the success of the postal department in dealing with the parcel post, shows clearly the capacity of the government to conduct public utilities successfully. As Postmaster-general Burleson points out, "The exorbitant rates and unsatisfactory service of the express companies finally provoked an agitation so insistent as to overcome the legislative inertia behind which the express monopoly lay entrenched. The day is passed when the patience and endurance of the people will compel the government to take care of the unprofitable parts of the postal business and let private monopoly continue to reap exorbitant profits for unsatisfactory administration of natural postal functions."

Therefore, Honorable Judges, because government

ownership is necessary, sound in basic principle, and practicable in operation, we ask that you support this resolution.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, L. L. RUMMELL, OHIO
STATE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The last speaker just told us that the European nations have lost money on the telephone and telegraph systems. According to the official reports of the various nations the telephone and telegraph receipts are so linked up with the postal receipts that it is impossible to tell whether a surplus or a deficit has been made on any one department. Yet we find that Germany and England in 1912, the latest figures available, returned more than \$22,000,000 each on their combined postal departments. Sixteen countries on the continent returned nearly \$125,000,000 the same year. Does this look as if these European countries are losing money on their postal departments?

He also told us that the rates in European countries are higher than in the United States if we consider the urgent service that is given in those countries. Such a comparison as the gentlemen from Indiana draw is just as unfair as to compare the postal rates of foreign countries with our special delivery letter rate in the United States because so few persons ever use this urgent telegram. This is a special feature that government ownership established that private ownership in the United States has not yet adopted.

The gentleman from Indiana has asked us where we

secured our rates on telephone and telegraph service in foreign countries. We have taken our figures from the official reports of the various nations. We find that they have taken their figures from the report of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Which authority will you choose?

The gentlemen have told us that the employees of the telephone and telegraph companies would make a powerful political machine. According to the gentleman's own figures there are 260,000 employees in all the telephone and telegraph companies and according to the census report nearly one-half of these are girls. This leaves only about 130,000 scattered over four and one-half million square miles and among 120,000,000 people. How much of a political machine would this make in any one community?

The last speaker of the opposition asked us how high the general rates should be. The rates should be such that they would give us the maximum of public service at the minimum of cost. What those rates should be in dollars and cents is a detail to be left to Congress to determine just as our postal rates have been fixed.

The gentlemen from Indiana have said that government methods are crude and that the government would not adopt new inventions. Yet private enterprise would not take over the telegraph itself in 1843 until after the government had appropriated \$30,000 and tried out the system for three years. Moreover, we find that in European countries under government ownership telephone communications and telegrams are sent simultane-

ously over the same wires and have been for a long time. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company is just now beginning to follow European example.

The gentlemen have said that there are more telephones in the United States than in European nations. This is not a true comparison of government ownership and private enterprise for it may be explained by the different economic status of the people in the United States and in European countries. The true comparison should be whether the extension would be greater under government ownership than it has been under private ownership. Applying this test we find that the extension in the United States has not been as great as it should be. Thus we find that while all the telephone companies, including the Bell, the Independent, the competing and connecting companies, have put but seventy-nine telephone stations in Montana, the government has put seven hundred and seventy-seven postoffices in the same state. While all these telephone companies have put but sixty-five exchanges in New Mexico, the government has put six hundred and twenty-nine stations in the same state. The same disproportion is seen in all our Western and Southern states. Even here in Kentucky and West Virginia on our own southern boundary the government has put from seven to eight times as many stations as private enterprise. Therefore, government ownership is necessary to extend these services to the outlying districts where private enterprise refuses to operate.

The last speaker has told us that the government can not secure the best men. Yet we find that the United

States Government secured the services of Mr. Goethals, the builder of the Panama Canal, after two foreign nations and private enterprises in the United States had failed. The United States engineers dredged out the New York harbor past Sandy Hook after private enterprise in the United States had failed twice. The United States railway mail clerks are considered the most efficient clerks in the world. Does this not look as if our government had been able to secure as efficient men as any private enterprise?

The gentlemen from Indiana have stated that there are more telephones in New York City than in all France. The gentlemen have only further carried out their comparison of the social wealth — the economic status — of the people in America and in Europe. However, there is not as much difference between New York and Germany or France, which the gentlemen have named, as between different parts of New York itself. Thus in the Manhattan and the Bronx there are ten telephones per 100 population while in the Queens, Richmond, and Brooklyn there are but four telephones per 100 population, and all these systems are under the same management showing that such differences are due entirely to the economic status of the people, and for these reasons we ask that you support this resolution.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, FRANK W. WATSON,
OHIO STATE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The speaker from Indiana spent a great amount of time in telling

you of the wonderful development of the telephone under private ownership in Stockholm. He took great pride in pointing out that the government also owned lines in that city. But Professor Holcombe, of the economics department of Harvard University, says: "In Stockholm the bankruptcy of the private company or the purchase of its business by the government is only a matter of time. Competition as a permanent status in the telephone business is neither desirable nor possible."

They tell you that regulation is the proper remedy for the evils that exist in the present system. But France, Holland, England, and New Zealand tried regulation of the telegraph and the telephone, and were forced to abandon such a policy and adopt government ownership. Count Bismarck, the great German statesman, says: "The inadequacy of private management and state supervision becomes daily more obvious." The gentlemen would have you believe that it costs the government more than it costs private enterprise to do a given piece of work. That is not the real question. The vital question is whether the ultimate service as it reaches the people costs more under government or private ownership. Government ownership in Europe has fixed rates at one-fourth to one-tenth that of American monopolistic rates. This shows that the government can do work even cheaper than private enterprise.

The speaker told you that the United States could not afford to take over the telephone and telegraph systems in this country. But the official figures for 1912 show that the United States has twice as much money as

England, France, or Germany, and six times as much as Italy. Our national debt is less than that of Germany or Italy, one-third that of England, and one-sixth that of France. What does the gentleman mean when he says the United States can not afford to take over these systems?

Our opponents pointed out that the greatest development of the telephone occurred in the United States. But Mr. Holcombe, who spent two years in Europe studying the economic development of the telephone, says: "The Swiss secured a wider and more prompt utilization of the telephone than occurred anywhere else on earth, led the way in the substitution of measures for unlimited service and have operated a technically sound system at rock bottom rates."

The gentlemen have told you repeatedly that the service in Europe is poor. But Mr. Holcombe points out, "that the German and Swiss telephone authorities have maintained a telephone service that has been both adequate in quantity and satisfactory in quality."

They tell you that wages are higher in America than they are in Europe, and that you can afford to pay more for the use of the telegraph and telephone. It does not make any difference what you can afford to pay. The real question is what you ought to pay. If the government can give you the service from one-fourth to one-tenth what private companies charge for it, then you want the service from the government.

The gentlemen would have you believe that politics would play a great part in the management of government

telegraphs and telephones. But ex-President Green, of the Western Union, says: "A judicious use of complimentary franks to government officials has saved the company many times the money value of the free service performed." This shows that politics could not be any worse under government ownership than they now are under private ownership.

The speaker said that government ownership is paternalistic. It is not paternalistic. There is no difference between a letter enclosed in an envelope and carried by the railroads and a letter put in writing, its contents carried by electricity to be again put in writing and delivered in an envelope. What, then, makes one a proper postal function and the other not a proper postal function? It is not paternalistic for the federal government to operate legitimate postal functions.

They tell you that the employees will not work as hard for the government as for private enterprise. But the work for the city carriers, rural carriers, and railway postal clerks is measured, and they are compelled to do a certain amount of work in a given time. The same could be done in the telegraph and telephone business. The number of telegrams or calls that the operator of average ability could handle in a given time could be determined, then they could be required to live up to the standard. Thus this objection is easily overcome.

The gentlemen maintain that the government will not extend the business. As soon as the government established the parcel post it gave to 20,000,000 people in rural districts personal express service that they had not had

under private ownership. There is no reason why the government would not adhere to the same policy and extend the telegraph and telephone business. Moreover, it has been the universal rule of nations that service has been extended as soon as government ownership has been established. England doubled her telegraph stations the first year and Holland increased the number of telephone users 300 per cent. in the first three years after the adoption of government ownership. For these reasons, Honorable Judges, we hold that government ownership is preferable to private ownership and government regulation.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, ARTHUR S. BURKETT,
OHIO STATE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have just been told that government ownership is unnecessary, that regulation is the proper remedy. But we already have forty-eight regulative commissions in forty-five states. Both Ohio and Indiana have them. We have tried regulation by the legislature, by the courts, by the people through the initiative and referendum, and we are now trying regulation by commissions. The federal government is trying regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and yet the evils of the present system continue unabated. Is it at all strange that we are now demanding government ownership to remedy this condition?

They tell us that the government would not improve the systems, since it would not adopt new inventions. American telegraph systems are still sending and receiving mes-

sages by hand, at a maximum of 50 words a minute. As far back as 1896 the English government system was sending over one-half of its messages by machine. England had adopted the Hughes printing system, the Stearns suplex, the Edison quadruplex, and the multiplex by which six word circuits can be obtained simultaneously and 2,500 words sent in a minute, inventions which even now American enterprise refuses to adopt extensively. Germany adopted the multiple telephone switch-board at least a year before we had the same invention in use here. England sent messages by wireless years before American interests could be interested in the same invention. Governments adopt new inventions and improvements quicker than private enterprise does.

We have been told that there is no water with telephone or telegraph stock because Congressman Lewis says there is none. Mr. Lewis makes no such broad assertion. In a personal letter here he says "his evidence is based merely on negative testimony,"— from the fact that the Bell telephone officials insist there is none.

The gentleman who just left the floor told you he was glad indeed that we mentioned Denmark because Denmark had private ownership and had an efficient system. Leaving out what other authorities say on the subject, the Bell telephone interests themselves, which the gentlemen defend, admit that "there is something rotten in Denmark." There must be some division in the gentleman's own authority.

They tell us the United States Government will not ex-

tend the systems. We have put systems in Alaska, Philippine Islands and Porto Rico after private enterprise had failed to enter the field. How much farther do the gentlemen want us to extend systems?

We are told there is no similarity between the telegraph and telephone and the other branches of mail service. The Supreme Court of the United States says in the case of Richmond vs. Telephone Company, 174 U. S. 761: "This transmission of written messages (by wire) is closely analogous to the United States mail service." We believe the opinion of our Supreme Court is entitled to some consideration in this matter.

The gentlemen have repeatedly told us that the present system is efficient, that government ownership is inefficient and they point to a few isolated cases of delay in Europe. But we have selected from the court of last resort of the gentlemen's own state, 105 cases of overcharge, discrimination, mistake, negligence, delay and even failure to deliver the message at all. These are set evidences of inefficiency. Here is the same number from our own state and here are over 1,000 from the country at large. This is only a portion of the cases that have come to the courts of last resort of our states. This does not include those cases from which no appeal is taken, those which are settled and dismissed, and the vast bulk of cases which never get into court at all. The conditions have been so bad in this country that the state legislatures have repeatedly made it a penal offense, punishable by fine to delay or fail to deliver a telegram. If any such

widespread condition of inefficiency had existed under government ownership, we believe that the gentlemen would have pointed it out to you.

We have been told that the measure is unjust since there will be a deficit to be made up by private taxation. We have pointed out that the existence of any deficit is as yet a speculation on the gentleman's part, and we have pointed out that the system would be self-supporting. But even if there were a deficit, there are over 100,000,000 people in the United States. Tax every one two cents a year and you provide for a \$2,000,000 deficit. Is this as unjust—to tax a person two cents a year—as it is to make each and every user of the telegraph pay ten to fifteen cents more on each telegram than he would under government ownership, and ten to fifteen cents more than the European citizen does for the same service?

The gentlemen of Indiana have told you that there is no agitation in favor of government ownership, that the people are satisfied. The people are not satisfied. The only thing is, we do not hear of the agitation. We have here on this chart \$100,000 worth of the recent advertising of the American Telephone Company, each advertisement from a different issue of a recent magazine. Do you imagine that the *Saturday Evening Post* would advocate government ownership when it would lose \$1,700 the next issue, or the *Youth's Companion* when it would lose a \$1,500 advertisement the next week, or the *Cosmopolitan* with a \$1,000 advertisement, or the *Farm Journal* with another \$1,000? Do you imagine under these cir-

cumstances that you would find articles in *Everybody's*, the *National Geographic*, the *Literary Digest*, or any of the rest of these? We started out to collect all the advertising for a year but before we had gone far we found that was impossible. Here is a quarter of a million dollars worth more, and that is only a part. And if there is no agitation in favor of government ownership, why does the telephone company employ Mr. Sylvan merely to hunt arguments against government systems, to draw up whole volumes of briefs against government systems, and to attend to the circulation and distribution of pamphlets like these, merely denouncing government ownership? There is an agitation for government ownership and sooner or later Congress must respond.

They tell us seventy-five per cent. of the systems are in the United States. We grant that this is true. If Texas were a lake, and either France or Germany an island, you could drop it right down in the lake and sail all around without seeing land on any side. If you can put a whole European country in a single state in America, why should we not expect more lines, wires, and exchanges?

The last gentleman in his plea to you has told you that the burden of proof was upon us throughout this discussion. We have met all that burden by the terms of this resolution by showing the necessity for establishment, the soundness of principle, and the practicability of operation of government ownership of the telegraph and telephone.

They tell us that there is no need for a change. We

have pointed out that the present system is a system of exorbitant rates and restricted service and intolerable and indefensible and must be changed.

They tell us the government will not improve the systems since it will not adopt new inventions. We have pointed out that government ownership has given other countries improvements and inventions which even now American enterprise refuses to adopt.

They tell us that government ownership is unnecessary; that regulation is the proper remedy. By their own showing they have admitted that some change is necessary. We have pointed out that regulation, as a remedy for the present evils, has already failed to give relief.

They tell us the measure is impracticable. We have pointed out that after adoption in nearly every nation in the world, government ownership has reduced rates, increased and extended service, and given efficient operation; that the United States government itself has efficiently operated systems under disadvantageous conditions in our outlying possessions.

We plead, therefore, Honorable Judges, that you do not longer delay the adoption of a measure so necessary, so sound in basic principle, and so practicable in operation; that you abridge the monopolists' mad race for profit at the expense of American progress and prosperity; that you accept a broad policy which will remove the reprehensible features of our present system, and which will give to the American people the unlimited use of the most powerful means of postal commun-

cation known to-day; in short, that you adopt this resolution.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY vs. INDIANA UNIVERSITY

FIRST NEGATIVE, JOHN W. BRICKER, OHIO STATE, '16.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman who just left the floor said that private ownership has restricted service to the thickly settled portions of the country. The average number of telephones in the United States, both urban and rural, for every one hundred inhabitants is higher than that of any city in the world where the government owns the system. In the United States the telephone is used twice as much as the postoffice; in Europe it is used only one-third as much.

If in the short space of thirty-nine years private ownership has developed in the United States to be the most efficient and widely used system in the world it is bad policy to change to government ownership as an experiment. In asking for this change, Honorable Judges, the gentlemen of Indiana, by the terms of the resolution this evening, must prove definitely three things. They must prove that evils exist in our present system, rates are too high, service is poor, organization defective, and that the attitude of the using public is such as to make government ownership necessary. For, if gross defects do not exist and the users are satisfied, it is manifestly unnecessary to ask for government ownership. In the second place, they must show that it is a govern-

mental function and in accord with American ideas and principles. Finally, they must prove that the government will operate this system efficiently, that it will remedy the evils which the gentlemen say exist in our present system and do it more effectively than any plan which we may suggest. Not until the gentlemen from Indiana have assumed this burden of proof can they ask for government ownership.

It is my purpose to show you, Honorable Judges, that government ownership is unnecessary. The second speaker will prove to you that it is an un-American idea and unsound in principle, and the third speaker will prove to you that government ownership is impracticable and has failed under the most favorable conditions. The American people deprecate unnecessary government action. The users of the telephone are the judges of the efficiency of the system, of whether they get a satisfactory equivalent in service for money expended. The American people, the great bulk of the users, are not clamoring for a change in ownership and operation. They are satisfied. We do not find our papers full of editorials asking for a change in system as is true in Europe. The United States has never experienced a petition of thirty-two thousand telephone users from one city asking for good service and a fair rate, nor has there ever been organized in the United States a "kickers' league" against the telephone service as was true in Paris, France. Certainly if our service were so poor that a change is necessary or even desirable, the people would rise up and advocate such a change.

In the second place, government ownership is unnecessary because rates are equitable and even much lower than in foreign countries when proper comparisons are made. For the gentlemen to cite rates does not mean anything. They must consider the service. In the comparison of rates four things must be considered. First, wages here and abroad; secondly, the deficit of the systems; thirdly, the kind of service rendered; and fourth, the size of the exchange. All of these factors would point to a higher rate in the United States.

According to Professor Holcombe, of Harvard, wages in the United States are two and one-half times higher than in Europe. The average wage of telephone operators in Paris is only forty-five per cent. of the New York wage; the London wage is fifty-five per cent. and the Berlin wage forty-six per cent. of the New York operator's wage. These facts alone would account for a higher rate in the United States.

There can be no comparison of rates for a toll service in the United States, the average connection of which takes six and one-half minutes, with European service which takes one hour and ten minutes. Local calls in the United States average sixteen or seventeen seconds for connection and in Europe the average time for connection is two minutes. Furthermore sixty per cent. of the stations in Europe close at five P. M. and do not open until eight o'clock the following morning while we have continuous service in the United States. The government owned systems of Europe are operating at a deficit of \$10,000,000 annually and our system pays

\$20,000,000 in taxes to the government. These facts must be considered before a fair comparison of rates can be made.

Again, when a telephone is added to a system anywhere that telephone increases the value of every other telephone in the system. One telephone is of no value, one hundred are worth much and one thousand are worth more. This is our basis of equitable rates. New York with two million less in population than London has 480,000 telephones to compare with 240,000 in London. The New York subscriber has twice the number of people to whom he can talk over his telephone. The New York telephone means more and should the subscriber not pay more for the service? The London rate is \$82. The rate in New York extends from \$48 to \$156. The New York rate is charged on the amount of service rendered, and eighty-one per cent. of the people in New York pay less than the London rate. Likewise, seventy-nine per cent. of the people in New York, ninety per cent. in Philadelphia, and ninety-one per cent. in Chicago pay less than the Paris flat rate of \$77. The American farmer pays on the average about \$20 for his telephone each year while in foreign countries the farmer is forced to pay the same rate as the city subscriber. Our rates are based upon a fair consideration of the service rendered.

The American telephone user has a right to be satisfied. Those equitable rates which we enjoy are for the most extensive telephone service in the world. The United States has only six per cent. of the world's ter-

ritory, five per cent. of the world's population, and seventy per cent. of the world's telephones. Here is a chart illustrating extension of our service. There is not much of a system outside of the United States, and the only distinguishing feature is in ownership and operation.

The State of New York has as many telephones as all of Germany; Ohio has as many as Great Britain; Chicago has more than London; and Boston twice as many as Paris. All twenty nations of Europe have only one-third as many telephones as the United States. The latest reliable figures we can secure show that in 1911 Berlin had five and three-tenths telephones for each one hundred inhabitants; Chicago, eleven (twice as many); Paris, two and one-half; Boston, nine and two-tenths (four times as many); London, three; and Los Angeles, twenty-four (eight times as many). Throughout all the United States, considering both urban and rural inhabitants, there are nine telephones for each one hundred inhabitants. In Great Britain there are one and three-tenths for each one hundred, and in Germany, one and eight-tenths for each one hundred people. This means that the American subscriber can reach six fellow citizens over his telephone while the Englishman can reach only one, and five where the German can reach only one.

The average number of telephones in the United States as a whole is very near as great as in our largest cities, while in the government owned systems of Europe the average falls far below the standard of our cities. This shows conclusively that private companies have extended

into the more thinly populated and less profitable territory much more extensively than any government owned system has ever done.

I have shown you, Honorable Judges, that the American people are satisfied and have a right to be satisfied with our telephone rates and service. They are paying equitable and comparatively low rates for the best and most extensive telephone service in the world.

The greater development and better service in the United States must be due to private ownership. If the affirmative contends that it is not, we challenge them to show us a greater determining factor in our wonderful development and perfection of service. Government ownership would blot out this most potent factor in our rapidly developing and constantly growing system. Therefore, we ask you to defeat this resolution.

SECOND NEGATIVE, RALPH W. LAUGHLIN, OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY, '17

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has shown that government ownership of the telegraph and telephone is unnecessary, because our rates are equitable and because our service is the best in the world. I will show that government ownership can not bring about the best management: first, because in government enterprise private business incentive is lacking; second, because government enterprise is slow in action; third, because it can not hire the most capable men; and last, because it is hampered by politics.

First, private business incentive is lacking. Private

business incentive is that which leads every business man to improve his produce and expand his business. It is an incentive to serve, for if the best service is not given the public will refuse the product. As a result of this private business incentive, we in the United States have invested in the telephone but two times as much as France, Germany, and England, and yet we have four times the development.

Government enterprise lacks such incentive because no encouragement is given to improvement and inventive skill. The Bell Telephone Company continuously employs five hundred and eighty men for the purpose of investigation and experimentation alone, in order that their systems may be made more efficient. If a man in their employ shows special skill or inventive ability he is given an opportunity to develop that ability — his ideas are given a trial. On the other hand, if an employee of the government invents or improves on anything, he is given no reward, neither does the government utilize his ability. Thus it was that Dr. Schurman, president of Cornell University said, "Creative epochs in industry are the works of individuals not of government."

Again, private business incentive is lacking because in government enterprise there can be no continuous plan of action. The captain of industry, who has placed his institution high in the commercial world, has done so by carrying out a well defined policy over a long period of years. He has grown up in the business. Theodore N. Vail has been head of the Bell Telephone Company for over fifteen years, and to him is due its great expan-

sion which yearly amounts to more than Great Britain's whole government owned system. On the other hand, the average term of the man who heads our great government enterprise is but two years. Postoffice work, of course, is relatively simple, but no matter how simple the business, it can not stand the shifting policy of a new head every two years.

The joint report in Congress in 1908 said, "It is too obvious to require argument that efficient service is not to be had as long as the business is, as at present, left to a postmaster general and certain assistants subject to frequent change."

Further, a permanent plan can not be carried out by a government enterprise because there is no definite financial policy. Government appropriations are made for no more than two years; they are not made until the need becomes a political issue. Deputy M. T. Steeg says of the French system: "The history of the telephone has been one of successive programs, brilliantly conceived but never carried out for lack of resources." In 1889 a change in the French telephone system was needed. In 1894 it was proposed; in 1905 it was given up; and, in 1906 an inadequate substitute was put through, which resulted in the fire that put Paris out of telephone service for over six weeks. Seventeen years of deterioration due to government ownership brought disaster. A private company would have corrected the evil in less than half as many months.

Suppose, however, that our appropriation system were satisfactory.. Government funds are too inflexible to

carry on any efficient enterprise. A few months ago some of the fine mechanism of one of the great recording clocks in New York City broke. The department controlling these clocks was taking in over two-thirds of a million dollars each day. The cost of repair was about ten dollars. Yet those clocks stood idle over three months because no money had been appropriated for repair. The department controlling these clocks was our one great government enterprise, the United States Post-office Department. We should like to ask our opponents what would become of the fine mechanism of a telegraph and telephone department under such inflexible control.

Therefore, we have shown that in government enterprise private business incentive is lacking. First, because no encouragement is given to improvement and inventive skill; second, because there can be no definite plan of action due to the short tenure of office and the uncertainty of finance; and third, because of the inflexibility of government control.

Government management can not secure the best result in the second place, because government enterprise is slow in action. When in 1908 the Guttenberg exchange burned in Paris the government wanted five months in which to replace it, but the need being so great the contract was let to the privately owned Western Electric Company of the United States, which made the installation in less than thirty-six days.

But you say this is inefficient France. Let us turn to Germany, the country which is commercially the most efficient in the world. In March, 1906, the Reichstag

passed a resolution for equitable distribution of rates between country and city districts. In 1907 it was passed again. In 1909 a bill was drawn up and submitted and in 1910 it appeared for second reading, but in 1911 a compromise was proposed but adjournment was taken with no action. Five years of fearfully inequitable rates and yet the country commercially most efficient in the world could come to no conclusion!

Now, let us return home. Two years ago a flood, destroying many lives and much property, swept Ohio and Indiana, and to-day Congress is still discussing whether it is the duty of the nation, the state or the local government to protect these districts. Two years have passed and the lives and property are still in danger, bridges are still down and traffic is still hampered. On the other hand private institutions have been rebuilt. The Bell Telephone Company replaced its lines in flood-swept Dayton in less than three days. In the gentlemen's own city of Indianapolis, when the Washington Street bridge went out, the Bell Telephone replaced its lines across the stream by the next evening but the bridge is still out. The rebuilding of the bridge depended upon government. These facts convince us that government enterprise is slow in action.

Government management can not secure the best results in the third place because the government, through its very nature, can not hire the best men. It can not pay sufficient salaries. John C. Black, president of the United States Civil Service Commission, says: "Government employees who make good in scientific or execu-

tive work for the government can always command better salaries outside of government service." Thus the great enterprising firms of the country will out bid the government.

Theodore N. Vail was once an employee of the post-office. He was trained by the government, but when he showed his great ability in organizing the railroad mail service, the Bell Telephone Company out bid the government and secured his services. Thus the most efficient managers will always be taken from the government. The government cannot pay one hundred thousand dollars a year for a manager of the telegraph and telephone department, and yet such a manager is the only kind that can manage such an immense business.

Lastly, government can not secure the best results because it is hampered by politics. Political expediency is considered in each move of a government enterprise. To-day civil service is the vogue and the "spoils system" is on the wane, but yet when the former has reached its height we shall still appoint our most important officials according to party lines and party politics. Senatorial courtesy will still be practiced, and Senator Jones will secure the appointment of Lawyer Smith as telegraph and telephone supervisor in his district, not because Smith has any knowledge of the telegraph or telephone but because he was Jones' strongest supporter in the last election.

Again, our opponents will have to agree with us in that "A," the head of a great private enterprise, would look for the efficient man, for the efficient man means an

efficient business or dollars and cents to him. While on the other hand, "B," the head of a government department, would look not so much for the efficient man as for the man with political prestige, for such prestige would hold "B" in his position or mean dollars and cents to him.

This, however, is not the only way in which government enterprise is hampered by politics — it is hampered by the appropriation of money. As we have said, appropriations are made in accord with the political issues and not in accord with the needs. If an additional line was needed in a government owned telegraph and telephone system, if a new equipment or a new station was needed, but the party in power had promised to cut the tariff, no money would be appropriated and thus a government owned system would depreciate.

Therefore, we have shown in this debate that government ownership is unnecessary because our rates are equitable and our service is the best in the world. We have shown that government management can not secure the best results: first, because in government enterprise private business incentive is lacking, second, because government enterprise is slow in action, and third, because it is hampered by politics.

We appeal to you to oppose the proposition which is unnecessary and which will make an efficient private enterprise into an inefficient government monopoly.

THIRD NEGATIVE, CHARLES F. LINDSLEY, OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the opposition continually hammer on the argument that the United States Postoffice is successful, and therefore the government has proved its ability to manage the telegraph and telephone systems. Now, the post-office can not be compared to the telegraph and telephone business from the standpoint of a commercial project. The postoffice business is simple. There is no plant to look after, no equipment to worry about, no intricate organization to maintain. Its managers do not have great financial problems to face. The postoffice department does not even own the buildings it occupies. The pneumatic tubes in cities such as New York, the mail cars, the delivery cars are all owned and operated by private companies. When we view these facts and consider that the Bell Telephone Company owns and operates property to the value of \$765,000,000, the unsound analogy drawn by our opponents is clearly manifest.

The gentlemen have taken twelve minutes of the time to point out great evils in our private companies. What have they done? They have done nothing but pick out a few isolated instances that would not include more than fifty thousand miles of wire. Why have they not pointed out gross defects in the great private companies. If these companies were corrupt and were failing to serve the people adequately, we believe our opponents would know about these evils and would not hesitate to point

them all out to you. Will you condemn the present system, Honorable Judges, on the scanty evidence they have here produced?

The opposition maintain that other countries own their telegraph and telephone lines and for that reason you should adopt this policy for the United States. Yes, other countries do own their systems. But, are they successful? Let us view the facts in the case. Government ownership has failed under the most favorable conditions. Germany presents the highest type of a centralized organization. The German government has absolute sway over its public utilities. Yet Germany has never been able to manage the telephone on a commercial basis, Mr. Herbert Law Webb, leading telephone expert on the continent, says that in Germany technical progress has been greatly restricted. Single wire overhead distribution was maintained after cable distribution had been adopted in America. Vital mistakes have been made in switchboard practice and great reconstruction has been made necessary. In fact, reconstruction is still in progress in the large cities of Germany, asserts Mr. Webb, and it will be many years before Germany has the same uniform style of plant and equipment as has existed for a long time in the United States. Yet conditions in Germany are the very best that can be cited under government ownership. Is this what we are looking for?

In France telephony is a slough of despond. According to so keen an observer as Lord Roseberry, the French bureaucracy has effectively strangled the French telephone system. The development is exceedingly low.

Equipment is antiquated; bad organization is the rule; the rate is the rate of the eighties. The outlying, rural subscriber, if he has a telephone, must pay just as much for it as the leading business man of Paris who has access to thousands of people. We have pointed out such vital technical blunders as in the Guttenberg exchange, a fire that left Paris partly stranded for months without telephone service; and in the Rue de Archives exchange where the ministry threw away seven million francs because of an absolute lack of foresight. We challenged the gentlemen of Indiana to point out such blunders in our private industries and as yet they have remained silent. Shall we take France as an example?

Let us turn to England. Are the systems owned by the government satisfactory here? No. Mr. C. S. Goldman, chairman of the last parliamentary telephone committee, concludes his last article, "What is wrong with the telephone," with these words: "Popular disgust throughout the country with the muddle and inefficiency of the postoffice department is so great that it only needs a little organization to make of it a force that no government could resist." Mr. Goldman says that a lack of foresight has always marked the attitude of the state toward the postoffice department; that the present arrangements are hopelessly unbusinesslike and that finances are involved. Then he concludes: "I believe that the only possible solution of the whole question is to take control of the telephone right away from the post-office and place it under a board of business men who will run it on commercial lines." Professor Hugo Meyer of

Chicago says that the state has always preferred the interest of its treasury department to the interests of the public as users of the telephone. When we consider these facts we know why Mr. Charles Brunning, that eminent English journalist, after a visit to this country writes in the *Evening Express*: "Wire talking is done so easily and surely in America that one wonders how a civilized people like we are presumed to be can stand for our ridiculous English telephone system. Truly, we are a long-suffering people." No wonder that Mr. Arthur Chamberlain could declare back in 1901, that pre-eminence in the electrical industry had gone to the United States because it had been throttled in England by the mischievous activity of the Home Office and local boards. No wonder that Professor Fleming, F.R.S., could declare in the same year that the most effective way of afflicting any department of applied science with creeping paralysis was to constitute it a government monopoly. And no wonder that the British press of to-day teems with editorials denouncing the systems in England as inefficient and unsatisfactory. Here are more than fifty of them which our opponents may read at their leisure. On the other hand, the American press is almost unanimous in advocacy of private ownership and operation. Now we should like for the gentlemen to explain—if the English systems are so good as they have just told you, and our private systems are so "rotten" as they say,—how do they reconcile these attitudes of the press? Gentlemen, we demand that you explain.

Not only has government ownership failed under the

most favorable conditions, but where private ownership operates side by side with government ownership, private ownership has given better service to the people. In Denmark most of the development is private and in Denmark there are two times as many telephones per hundred people as in Germany, two and one-fourth as many as in England, three times as many as in the Netherlands, four times as many as in Belgium and six times as many as in France. Norway and Sweden have private ownership and they rank next. In the city of Stockholm, under private ownership, there are more telephones than in any other city in Europe. These are the conditions in Europe under private monopoly. How do our opponents explain these facts?

We can come closer home. Look at the Province of Manitoba on our northern boundary. In 1911 the Premier, speaking at Norwood, said: "It is our purpose to give the telephone to all classes at cost. The laboring man should have a telephone just as the professional man." He appointed a committee to investigate and in its report the committee said: "We can cut the Bell rates in two and still make a profit." They published tables of future rates just one-half the Bell rates. On these promises they bought out the Bell Company. Now what was the result? In two months they had raised the rates in Winnipeg twenty-five per cent. In two years they declared the rural telephone service inadequate. In three years they had raised the long distance rates from eighty per cent. to three hundred and fifty per cent., and cut the time limit from three to two minutes. At

this time the Premier, speaking in the legislature, said: "We have made a grave mistake." We maintain, Honorable Judges, that if the little province of Manitoba can not operate a few hundred telephone stations, then it is not sound to argue that the United States could operate all the stations in this nation.

But this is not all. In 1895 our own Department of Interior at Washington installed a telephone service of its own. They gave it up. We wrote for the reasons and here is their letter. Let me read: "In 1895 we installed an inter-departmental telephone of one hundred and forty stations. After four years complaints were so numerous and dissatisfaction so great that an investigation was found necessary. After careful examination it was found that to obtain an efficient service it would be necessary to install new equipment. So we entered into a contract with the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company and are now renting out telephones." Here is a case of a single state department trying to operate one hundred and forty stations of its own, making a failure of it after four years, giving it up, and now renting telephones from a private company. Yet in the face of these facts the gentlemen of Indiana urge you to let the government operate all the lines of the nation. Does their request seem logical?

Thus, I have shown you that under the most favorable condition in small, centralized, bureaucratic, militaristic countries government ownership has failed. I have shown that where private operation exists side by side with government management, private ownership is su-

perior. And lastly, I have shown that under conditions almost identical with those of the United States, the policy advocated by the gentlemen of the affirmative is a failure. Therefore, since this proposal is wrong in its conception, wrong in its principle and practice, we present to you a substitute plan, the plan of government regulation. We would have a commission for each state and one for the United States to regulate only telegraph and telephone rates and service. Regulation is a success. Only a few months ago the railroads were on their knees before the Interstate Commerce Commission begging for an increase in freight rates, not one cent of which could be had without the consent of the commission. Regulation is a success. Forty-two states have regulative bodies of some kind. Through the constraint of regulation the gas companies of Indianapolis were merged, and this now saves to that city more than one hundred thousand dollars a year. Preliminaries have now been taken to merge the Indianapolis Telephone Company. Utilities under regulation must prove their right to exist. When Boswell's Farmers' Telephone Company in the northern part of the state wanted to put up its lines, the commission of Indiana said: "You are not necessary," and they were not granted a franchise. Last year, the Bell, in order to sell some rural exchanges just out of Indianapolis, had to get the consent of the commission. Regulation fixes rates. One year ago the Bell Company wanted more for its service in Indianapolis. They went to the commission. The commission said, "You can't have any more." And the rates are just

the same to-day as they were before. Does this not prove that regulation is a success when we consider that regulation has been in operation in this state but for two years? If we had a government monopoly, to whom could people appeal. There could be no appeal. Nothing short of a political revolution could effect a change.

Therefore, which plan will you support? This communistic, paternalistic plan presented by the gentlemen of Indiana or the sane, rational plan of regulation which has been adopted in forty-two states as most desirable, and which is advocated by our foremost political and industrial leaders? Regulation or ownership?

Therefore, since this measure is unnecessary because rates are relatively low, because our service is the best in the world, and because the people are satisfied; since this proposal can not secure the best results because government action is slow, because political favoritism can not secure the best men, and because business incentive will be lacking, and since government ownership has not worked out in practice to the best interests of the people, we ask that you refuse to sanction this resolution.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, JOHN W. BRICKER, OHIO STATE
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have told you that rates are too high in the United States. They have not taken into consideration the kind of service that is rendered for their quoted rates. They have quoted a two hundred and twenty-eight dollar rate in New York. One-half of

one per cent. of the subscribers pay this rate, but we have shown you that actually eighty-one per cent. of the New York subscribers pay less than the London flat rate of eighty-two dollars. The rate in the United States is based by our private companies upon a just and equitable consideration of the services that are rendered while government ownership has never considered service. Taking these facts into consideration the affirmative has no basis to contend that our rates are high. Our opponents have not denied that the United States has only five per cent. of the world's population but has seventy per cent. of the world's telephones, and yet they assert that our telephone service is limited to the thickly settled regions and more profitable territory. There are nine telephones in the United States for every one hundred people, counting both urban and rural inhabitants. This average is even greater than in any large city of the world under government ownership.

Side by side with government ownership in Europe, private companies in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have given service twice as extensive as government ownership has given. How do the gentlemen of Indiana account for these facts? To establish their point for government ownership our opponents must prove that the government would have developed these systems more extensively than private companies have done, and that this development could be made without injuring service or development in our centers of industry.

Our opponents have cited the postoffice as an example of a government monopoly. It is older than the nation,

has practically no capital invested, and requires no special skill for operation, while our telephone is only thirty-nine years old, is worth a billion dollars, and requires special skill in operation. They say our postal rate is low. Few other countries have as low a rate, and our postal system is to-day three hundred and thirty million dollars behind. This enormous deficit has been made up by indirect taxes, the most unjust form of taxation upon the people.

The second speaker of the affirmative told you that the government in rendering this service would be actuated by a public service motive. Postmaster General Burleson in his last report to Congress advocated a return to the old "star route" system of delivering rural mail only because the rural free delivery is incurring a deficit. Yet he admitted rural free delivery to be the best system we have ever had. Does this not look as if public officials are influenced by financial and political motives in the rendering of service?

Regardless of facts presented the third speaker of the affirmative assumed that private development is limited to large cities and that government development is general and extensive. How do our opponents account for the fact that sixty per cent. of our telephones are in exchanges of less than three hundred subscribers, and that one-third of our nine million telephones are in the homes of farmers? In singular contrast to this, under government ownership in France thirty-two per cent. of the telephones are in Paris, in Austria, thirty-five per cent. are in Vienna, and in Belgium, thirty-seven per cent. are

in Brussels. These facts show that our opponents have no basis for assuming that the government would extend the service. For these reasons, Honorable Judges, we ask you to defeat this resolution.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, RALPH W. LAUGHLIN, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the opposition have said that there would be no politics in a government owned and operated telegraph and telephone system. We have shown in our first speech how the head of the government department would select the man with political prestige, for such prestige would hold him in his position.

Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of the House Appropriation Committee, said: "During Republican administration it was the custom to appoint the chairman of the National Republican Committee Postmaster-general so as to insure the partisanship of the subordinates." This is what we mean by politics in government enterprise.

The gentlemen have said that they would take over the telegraph and telephone for the government in order to prevent the immense profit which is being made by the present owners. We defy the gentlemen to point out one millionaire that the telegraph and telephone business has made. We would like to know what other business of such immense size has not made many millionaires. In comparison with big industries the telegraph and telephone profits are not only moderate but low.

The gentlemen have said that private enterprise has

restricted service to the populous districts. It is only natural that densely populated Ohio should have more telephones than sparsely settled Nevada. But do the gentlemen know that sixty per cent. of the telephones are in exchanges of three hundred and less? On the other hand government owned systems have restricted their service thus: Thirty-two per cent. of the telephones are in the city of Paris, thirty-five per cent. of the telephones of Austria are in Vienna, and thirty-seven per cent. of the telephones of Belgium are in Brussels. Which system has restricted service?

The gentlemen say that under private ownership profits are always first. How do they account for the fact that fourteen per cent. of the offices of the Western Union make a profit? How does it come that twenty thousand are run at a loss?

The gentlemen say that our postoffice stands second in rates, but we stand twelfth, and yet we have a deficit of over three hundred and thirty million at present which is an added burden to the people. The gentlemen say that they would extend the telephone to the masses. How does it come that Chicago has more telephones than all France? New York and Chicago have more than all of Great Britain? Philadelphia more than all Russia? Los Angeles more than all Italy? In fact, the government owned systems of Europe have established a flat rate whereby the resident telephone users must pay as much as the professional man, the corporation, and the big business man. This keeps the telephone from the masses instead of giving it to them.

The affirmative have said that our rates are high—but they have not considered the relative value of money. It is true in Europe that ten cents is paid for a twenty-five word message while in the United States we pay twenty cents. Let us give you an example of the money value in Europe. The laborer on the continent makes three dollars a week, while the laborer in the United States makes nine dollars. Therefore, three dollars there are worth nine here. And thus, if we pay two times as much, we are still paying one-third less in real money for our service.

In comparing these rates, however, our opponents have been unjust because they have compared the rate for ordinary service over there with rates for urgent service over here. Why do they not compare their urgent service rates with our urgent service rates, for when such comparisons are made we find that a telegram which in the United States costs twenty-five cents, costs sixty cents in Norway, fifty-three cents in Germany, fifty-four cents in Austria, and forty-nine cents in Italy. Thus our rates for the same service are even lower without regard to money value. Again they compared the highest rate in New York City with the flat rate in Europe, and they say that we pay \$288 for the same service for which the European pays \$77. This is just as absurd as it would be for us to compare the low resident rate of New York with the flat rate of Europe. Thus we would say that we pay \$48 per year while in Europe they pay \$77, and this would be even more just for only one-half of one per cent. of the subscribers in New York pay this high

rate of \$288, while seventy-nine per cent. pay less than the flat rate of Europe.

Our opponents say that they would let the government own the telephone in order to secure military efficiency, but military efficiency does not mean low rates or extended service. It means efficiency of operation for military purposes.

They say that the private lines could be easily bought. We think that the government could take over these systems but in doing so they would triple our national debt. New Zealand has taken over private enterprise in this manner and as a result they have a debt per capita of over \$400. Our present debt is less than \$10 per capita. Do we want to follow New Zealand's example?

The gentlemen say that there is watered stock in the telegraph and telephone companies, but they have pointed out only a few isolated cases involving small companies. Why do they not point out these evils in the great corporations of the country? The Bell Telephone Company has had three hundred and seventy million dollars paid into its coffers and yet has issued only three hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of capital stock. Mr. M. Lewis, the strongest advocate of the affirmative's proposition in the House of Representatives, says: "Be it said for the Bell system that it is the one great corporation that has not issued tons of counterfeit capital."

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, CHARLES F. LINDSLEY, OHIO
STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Our opponents hammer the idea of the parcel post. They argue that because the government has increased its mail business by agreeing to carry parcels that it has shown its ability to run the telegraph and telephone. This is a lame comparison. In the parcel post the government did not attempt anything new. It only added to the work of the postoffice. It did nothing but announce a new rate for a new class of mail matter. It made no great outlay of money. The machinery was all complete. The government did not begin a new business.

They tell us that the conditions of employees would be better under government management. Let us inform the gentlemen that the government has no old age pensions, no sick benefits, no death benefits, no insurance compensation, and all of these have been adopted by private companies that they might better the condition of their employees. Not long ago the telephone employees of Manchester, England, met in a solid protest. They declared that the government had broken its promises and was underpaying them, and that promotion was made on the ground of favoritism and not service. Does this seem as if the government would better the condition of the telephone and telegraph employees?

They want to know why we talk about the telephone all the time and not the telegraph. We do this because there are thirty-two times as many telephones as tele-

graph stations, and railroads are fast going over to the use of the telephone. Our opponents point out that in certain times of special stress the postoffice has served the public free of charge. Do they not know that two years ago at flood time the Bell Telephone Company furnished free telephone service to many of the communities in Ohio and Indiana? The private companies are not behind the government in this regard. They tell us that there will never be any labor trouble, any strikes, etc., under government control. What about the postal strike in England last Christmas which tied up the mail for more than a month?

They contend that the economic status of the people explains why there are more telephones in this country than abroad. Then, why is it that Denmark, Norway, and Sweden under private ownership rank next to the United States in service and efficiency? We have repeatedly demanded that our opponents explain this, and they persist in keeping silent.

The affirmative complain of the service. They say that almost every message is delayed. Here is a message I received this afternoon sent from Columbus to Bloomington and delivered in nine minutes; and in less than fifteen minutes after this contest the results of your decision will be sent across the wires and will be read in the auditorium of Ohio State University. In Europe the service in England is called "The-get-them-when-you-can-service." In France the Chamber of Commerce at Chambery says that if you call Paris you get the connec-

tion the day after the request for connection is filed. Under which kind of ownership does it appear that we have the better kind of service?

They have referred repeatedly to the service in Australia. In 1908 a royal commission was appointed to investigate Australian conditions. Here is a printed extract from the report which says in plain terms that the systems are not satisfactory. Testimony was gathered in South Australia, West Australia, New Zealand, New South Wales, and Tasmania from chambers of commerce, boards of trade, press associations, and in no one of these states was the telephone system efficient. The report concludes with these words, "Your commissioners consider that the magnitude of complaints received indicates the existence of strong dissatisfaction, and your commissioners are of the opinion that the complaints are entirely justified, and are convinced that to obtain an efficient service it is essential that improved methods in finance, management, and organization be promptly adopted." Does this, Honorable Judges, look as if the systems are successful in Australia?

From the beginning of this debate it devolved upon the gentlemen of Indiana to prove three things: (1) Gross evils in the present system, (2) that government ownership is a government function, (3) and that government ownership is the best means of securing better service and lower rates. We ask you in all fairness, have they squarely met this burden. They argue for a theoretical plan. We have shown you clearly that management un-

der private control has given us the most efficient system of the world; that our service is the quickest; our development the greatest. Will you vote with the gentlemen to tear down this monument of efficiency? We have pointed out definitely that the government can not secure the best results because conflicting legislative bodies cannot act quickly; because political favoritism will fail to employ the most efficient men; and because private business incentive will be lacking. The gentlemen of Indiana tell you that we should centralize all utilities under the federal head; we have proved that it is not the function of the American government to swallow up private enterprise. They would thrust upon you a scheme of paternalism; we plead for the perpetuation of democracy. Finally, we have demonstrated the impracticability of government ownership. We have pointed out that in small, centralized, military, bureaucratic countries government ownership has failed. We have pointed out that where private ownership exists side by side with government ownership, private ownership is superior. Lastly, we have offered a substitute plan, which is in direct accord with American tendencies and our principles of government. Therefore, Honorable Judges, because this proposal is wrong in its principle, because it will not work out in practice, and since in addition to these two fatal defects it is absolutely unnecessary, we plead with you to stand by the present system, and not to support a scheme which will drag down the ideal of American efficiency; in short, that you defeat this resolution.

OHIO STATE BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL REFERENCES

American Telegraph and Telephone Company. Annual Report, 1910-1913, A. T. & T. Co. Comparative summary of laws relating to regulation of telegraph and telephone companies by commission in force Nov. 1, 1913. 3d ed. 710 pp. 1914.

Brooks, S. *Aspect of Public Ownership. North American Review*, 194:199-200, 356-66, 541-52, 737-47; 195:496-512, 649-64. Aug.-Nov., 1911. April-May, 1912.

Craig, A. H. In his *Pros and Cons*, pp. 185-98.

The Government and the Telegraph: Opinion on All Sides. Public Opinion, 4:399-401, Feb. 4, 1888.

Hadley, A. T. In his *Railroad Transportation*, pp. 252-58.

Holcombe, A. N. *Public Ownership of the Telephone on the Continent of Europe.* (In *Harvard Economic Studies*, v. 6.)

Holcombe, A. N. *The Telephone in Great Britain. Review of Reviews*, 35:243-45, Feb., 1907.

Postal, Telegraph, and Telephone Lines: Information Furnished by Diplomatic and Consular Offices of the U. S. (In U. S. 55th Cong., 2d Sess, 1897-1898. Sen. Doc. 39, Parts 1-2, 332-66 pp. Ser. No. 3592).

Stanton, T. *Political Side of State Ownership in France. North American Review*, 198:248-56, Aug, 1913.

United States Bureau of the Census. Telephone, 1907. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910, 129 pp.

United States Bureau of the Census. Telephone and Telegraph, 1902. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1905, 49 pp., Bul. 17.

United States Bureau of the Census. Telephone and Telegraph, 1902. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906, 172 pp.

AFFIRMATIVE

Clark, Walter. *The Telegraph and Telephone properly parts of the Post Office System. Arena*, 5:464-71, March, 1892.

Clark, Walter. *Why the Government should Own the Telephone and Telegraph. Arena*, 26:519-20 Nov., 1901.

Ely, R. T. *The Telegraph Monopoly*. *North American Review*, 149:44-53, July, 1889.

Holcombe, A. N. *Municipal Ownership of the Telephone in Great Britain*. *Quarterly Journal Economics*, 21:645-50, Aug., 1907.

Lewis, D. J. *The Postalization of the Telegraph and Telephone*. (In *Congressional Record*, Vol. 51, No. 29, Jan. 21, 1914, p. 2124-2131.)

Lusk, H. H. *Government Telegraph and Telephone in Australia*. *Review of Reviews*, 27:337-8, March, 1903.

Meyer, H. R. *Public Ownership and the Telegraph in Great Britain*. (Review) *Journal Political Economy*, 16:631-34, Nov., 1908.

Parsons, Frank. *Arena*, 27:179-87, Feb., 1902.

Parsons, Frank. *Reasons for Public Ownership of Telephone*. *Mun. Aff.*, 6:683-700, 1903.

Parsons, Frank. *Why the Public Should Own and Control the Telephone*. *Arena*, 27:297-302, March, 1902.

Seligman, E. R. A. *Government Ownership of Quasi-Public Corporations*. *Gunter*, 20:305-22, April, 1901.

NEGATIVE

American Telegraph and Telephone Co. *Brief of Arguments against Public Ownership*, Vol. 1-3, Supplements, 1 to 26.

Berthold, V. M. *Chief Causes of Failure of Municipal Telephone in Great Britain*. *Quarterly Journal Economics*, 221:303-14, Feb., 1908.

Casson, H. N. *The Telephone in Foreign Countries*. In his *History of the Telephone*, 1910, p. 252-72.

Fallacy of Public Ownership. *Gunter*, 25:377-85, Nov., 1903.

Hadley, A. T. *Some Difficulties of Public Ownership Management*. *Political Science Quarterly*, 3:572-90.

Leroy-Beaulieu, P. *Public Ownership in France*. *North American Review*, 197:295-311, March, 1913.

Bell Telephone News, Vol. 4, No. 4, p. 3-4, Nov. 1914; Vol. 4, No. 33, p. 4, Oct. 1914.

Vail, T. N. *Public Utilities and Public Policy*, *Atlantic Monthly*, 111:315-9, March, 1913.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

THE MINIMUM WAGE—I

*FRIENDS UNIVERSITY vs. FAIRMOUNT
COLLEGE and PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY*

In the triangular debates of the Fairmount-Friends-Phillips league held April 24, 1914, Friends University won on both sides of the Minimum Wage question discussed. The Affirmative team met Phillips University Negative at Wichita, Kansas, winning 3 to 0. The Negative team met the Fairmount Affirmative at Fairmount College also in Wichita, Kansas, and won 2 to 1. At Enid, Oklahoma, the Phillips Affirmative team defeated Fairmount's Negative 2 to 1.

The Minimum Wage question has been an extremely popular one in debating circles since the first debate, an interclass debate at Ottawa University, was published in an earlier volume in this series of Intercollegiate Debates. The present debate brings the subject up to date in argument and material.

The statement of the question in the following debate read:

Resolved, that through appropriate legislation a minimum wage scale should be put into operation in the United States.

The speeches of Friends University given here were contributed by Mr. John M. Michener, of Wichita, Kansas, one of the debaters representing Friends.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

FRIENDS UNIVERSITY vs. PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, FRANK D. LOGSDON, FRIENDS
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have for consideration this evening, a question that is destined to affect the welfare of six millions of our fellow citizens. It has for its purpose the relieving of the sufferings of a part of that great mass of our population generally known as the laboring class or the wage earners. It is a question of legislation seeking to regulate a little more fully the greed of organized capital on the one hand and the need of the unorganized, sweated worker on the other hand.

This question is: "Resolved, that through appropriate legislation a minimum wage scale should be put into operation in the United States."

By the use of the words "appropriate legislation," we mean that any and all laws necessary for the successful operation of a minimum wage scale, shall be enacted. The government is able to enact legislation that will put any just measure into operation. Therefore, all consid-

eration of the means of obtaining a minimum wage scale or any of its attendant difficulties is eliminated from this discussion.

A minimum wage should be defined as a living wage. This is perhaps best defined by Samuel McCune Lindsay, professor of social legislation in Columbia University. He says: "The living wage is defined as compensation for labor performed under reasonable conditions and sufficient to enable employees to secure for themselves and those who are or may be reasonably dependent upon them, the necessary comforts of life." Every normal worker should live by his work because a normal production justifies a living wage or in other words a minimum wage. The minimum wage then, must be based on the normal production of a normal worker and must be sufficient to enable him to maintain a decent standard of life.

By the use of the word "scale," we mean that different wages shall be established for different industries and for different sections of the country whenever it is found advisable to do so. Then by legislation a minimum wage is to be fixed below which no employer may pay for normal production. However, he is in no sense restricted from paying a higher wage than the minimum wage scale dictates. This scale must not be charity nor must it steal from the employer. It must be only the just reward to every normal worker.

It may be thought that such legislation involves a new and untried principle but in reality it is only the latest example of factory legislation. Such legislation is not

confined to the last few years but dates from about the beginning of the nineteenth century; it is not confined to one race or nation but is fast including the whole civilized world.

A fair example for all Europe may be found in England. For more than a century England has been prescribing by law the minimum conditions of the wage contract. Starting with the enactment of a legal minimum of sanitation and safety in the workshop and mine, factory legislation has gradually broadened until it now includes the minimum wage itself.

In the United States, factory legislation is of a more recent origin, dating its beginning from the rise in power of organized capital. From this time each period of factory aggression has been followed by a period of factory legislation. Such legislation has gradually grown until now it includes the following phases: (1) the protection of life and health, (2) the hours of labor, (3) child labor, (4) convict labor, and (5) employers' liability.

A report from the Select Committee on Home Work for 1908 in the House of Commons in Great Britain makes the following statement: "It is quite as legitimate to establish by legislation a minimum standard of remuneration as it is to establish such a standard of sanitation, cleanliness, ventilation, air space, and hours of work. Experience teaches that the usual result of the legislation referred to is not to kill the industry but to reform it."

The first minimum wage law came into existence eighteen years ago. It was first adopted in Victoria, a

province of Australia, in 1896. It has since spread to the other provinces of Australia and into New Zealand. It was temporary when first enacted and was applied to five trades only. It has since been renewed five times until as Mr. Sidney Webb says, "One is tempted, indeed, to believe that little now remains outside its scope except the agriculture occupation and domestic service."

A few years later England, feeling the need of additional protection for her working men, started an investigation of the workings of the minimum wage law in Australia. As a result of this investigation the Trade Boards Act came into operation on the first of January, 1910. Like the Australian law, it was at first experimental and was applied to four trades only but is at present being rapidly extended.

From here the minimum wage idea spread to the United States where it is fast gaining ground. The minimum wage is, at the present time, in operation in eight states: Washington, California, Colorado, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Massachusetts and Utah.

It is in view of the preceding facts, Honorable Judges, that the question already stated must be considered. We, of the affirmative, in maintaining that such a law would be advisable, base our argument on the following five points: (1) Present labor wages are unjust, (2) minimum wage scale will remove this injustice, (3) a minimum wage scale is just to skilled labor, employer, and public, (4) minimum wage scale will simplify social problems, and (5) the main objections are problems of adjustment.

I shall take up the first two of these contentions: (1) Present labor wages are unjust, and (2) minimum wage scale will remove this injustice.

Present labor wages are unjust for (a) bargaining and not production is the practical basis of wages, and (b) many laborers do not now receive a living wage.

Let us take up my first subpoint: Bargaining and not production is the practical basis of wages. This is brought about by the fact that capital, because of its greater power and organization, has all the advantage in the field of bargaining. On the side of labor, there are two distinct classes of laborers affected by the bargain contract: These are individual and organized classes. Examples of the latter class are unions and other organizations of labor. They bind themselves together in order that they may improve their wages and working conditions. J. Laurence Laughlin in the *Atlantic Monthly* for October, 1913, says: "The unions have a definite objective: to increase wages (not merely money wages, but real wages); that is, to get more reward for the same effort, per hour and per day, or to get the same wages for less number of hours; and to better the sanitary and hazardous conditions of work." Unions, however, do not work for the interests of all laborers on a basis of production. Those out of the unions are left to shift for themselves, while those in the unions reserve for themselves all the benefits of the organization. Richard T. Ely in his "Outlines of Economics," says: "Higher paid workmen are in better organized trades

and gain more than do the others from the advantages of collective bargaining."

Let us now look at some actual examples where organized labor has gained an advantage over unorganized. By organization, the members of the National Print Cutters' Association of America have increased their wages from twelve to twenty dollars per week. In the printing establishments of Omaha that employ non-union men, the wages are twelve dollars per week in contrast to eighteen dollars per week in those employing union men. In Wichita, linemen for the Bell Telephone Company, a corporation employing non-union men, receive only forty dollars per month, while union linemen on the Arkansas Valley Interurban receive seventy-five dollars per month.

It is unreasonable to suppose that such a great difference in skill exists as these figures would indicate, nor is this possible. In fact no sharp and distinct line can be drawn between the ability of union and non-union men. To-day a man may be out of the union and to-morrow he may be taken in. To-day we can not say he is worth forty dollars a month and to-morrow he is worth seventy-five dollars a month.

What then, is the cause of this great difference in wages? The answer is found in the greater bargaining power of organized labor. Richard T. Ely, in his "Introduction to Political Economy," shows how this is possible. He says: "Let us suppose one capitalist employs one thousand men. If these men are not organized, each man individually treats with all the capital in the establishment. All the capital is represented by one man, but

one laborer represents but a thousandth part of the labor force, and he is not in a position of equality."

Now, Honorable Judges, we of the affirmative maintain that minimum wage legislation is needed to protect this unorganized class of labor in the unequal struggle in which capital has forced the wages below a living wage.

But perhaps the negative will say we can remedy the evil by organizing all labor. To organize the sweated laborers, the ones most needing it, is practically useless, not to say impossible. The sweated trades require but little skill. Even in the skilled trades capitalists are able to secure strike breakers. To do so in the sweated trades would be a most simple matter. John A. Hobson in his "Problems of Poverty" says: "The sweated worker cannot organize because he is so poor, so ignorant, and so weak."

Now the second point: Many laborers do not now receive a living wage. Several recent inquiries, conducted by private agencies and public authorities, into the cost of maintaining a decent standard of living, have reached very similar conclusions. In one of these, Dr. R. C. Chapin, basing his conclusions upon the needs of a family of five, says: "An income under eight hundred dollars is not enough to permit the maintenance of a normal standard. On the other hand, an income of nine hundred dollars or over probably permits the maintenance of a normal standard, at least so far as the physical man is concerned. Whether an income between eight and nine hundred dollars can be made to suffice is a question to which our data does not warrant a dogmatic

answer. Reports from other cities indicate that the minimum wage for Pittsburg should be as high as for New York, that in Baltimore it is seven hundred and fifty dollars, and that in Philadelphia, Boston, and Buffalo it is somewhere between seven hundred and fifty dollars and nine hundred dollars."

Now what do these people earn? Seven reports from six different authorities, taken from this same territory, practically agree in their conclusions as to the average wages that these people receive. These reports say that, with twenty per cent. deducted for unemployment, nine-tenths of the adult males receive under eight hundred dollars per year. Three-fourths receive under six hundred dollars, one-half receive under five hundred dollars and one-tenth receive under three hundred and twenty-five dollars. It is clear, then, that the wages of one-half of these laboring men are far enough below the standard to work an actual hardship.

The minimum wage scale will remove this injustice for (a) production will determine the lower limit of wages and (b) all normal workers will receive a living wage.

i. Production will determine the lower limit of wages. Wherever the minimum wage law is in operation it is based upon the normal production of a normal worker in the different trades and industries. Employers are prohibited by law from hiring a normal worker for less than the minimum wage prescribes. No restriction, however, is placed upon any increased amount which the employer may pay and the employee may earn. Moreover, Hon-

orable Judges, according to the general theory and practice, production determines, the basis of the minimum wage, as we have shown to you in the introduction.

2. All normal workers will receive a living wage. To show that this principle works out in practice as well as in theory we quote Matthew B. Hammond, professor of economics and sociology in Ohio State University. He says: "We may say without hesitation, I think, that sweating no longer exists, unless perhaps in isolated instances, in Melbourne or in other industrial centers of Victoria. This is the opinion expressed to me not only by the officials in the factory inspectors' office, including the women inspectors, but also by Mr. Samuel Mauger, the secretary of the Anti-Sweating League, who is constantly on the alert to detect any evidence of sweating and to ask for the appointment of a board in any trade in which it is thought to exist." By sweating is meant, working for an insufficient wage or for excessive hours or under abnormal conditions. In other words no evidence can be detected where normal workers receive less than a living wage. This is undoubtedly the theory of the minimum wage.

Honorable Judges, in conclusion let us sum up the argument thus far advanced. In maintaining that a minimum wage scale should be put into operation in the United States, we have established two main points, (1) present labor wages are unjust and (2) a minimum wage scale will remove this injustice.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, GERVAS A. CAREY, FRIENDS
UNIVERSITY

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has proved two main points. First, that present labor wages are unjust, and second, that a minimum wage scale will simplify social problems.

I. A minimum wage scale will be just to skilled labor because:

1. Skilled labor is capable of self-protection.
2. Skilled labor is entitled to no special privileges.
3. Wages vary with efficiency.
4. Skilled labor has approved the minimum wage in Victoria, when tried.

Consider my first sub-point — Skilled labor is capable of self-protection. It is generally recognized that practically all skilled labor is organized. Ely, in his "Outline of Economics," in discussing bargaining, says: "If the bargain is between an employer and an individual workman, the advantage is apt to be all on one side," but, "where laborers can bargain in groups rather than as individuals their disadvantages are greatly lessened." Not only is this true in theory, but my colleague has given you instances of the higher wages secured by organized labor and union men,— skilled labor is capable of self-protection.

My second sub-point — Skilled labor is entitled to no special privileges. Our contention is for justice, the wages of skilled labor should be based on production, not on bargaining power; skill that can produce two mini-

mums of production is entitled to twice minimum wages, no more. And if, in any instance, skilled labor has succeeded in getting a wage beyond the relative value of its production it would be no injustice to cut that wage accordingly.

My third sub-point—Wages vary with efficiency. Ely, before quoted, states, “That wages vary with the efficiency of individual laborers is a fact of common observation. Wages are paid for the products of individual laborers and the amount of a laborer’s product obviously depends very largely upon his efficiency.” Even a farmer acts upon this principle in that he will hire two men, one at thirty and one at thirty-five dollars a month. The five dollars difference in wages represents the farmer’s estimate of the difference in the efficiency of the two men.

My fourth sub-point—Skilled labor has approved of minimum wage in Victoria, when tried. Mr. Ernest Aves, sent by the King of England to investigate wage boards in Australia, reported: “There is in Victoria, a great preponderance of opinion among all classes in favor of the retention of the boards.”

In his treatise—“The Economic Theory of a Legal Minimum Wage”—Sidney Webb, of England, says concerning minimum wage in Victoria: “We must notice, too, that the application of the law has been demanded by skilled trades as well as by unskilled.”

Honorable Judges, I have shown to you that:

1. Skilled labor is capable of self-protection.
2. Skilled labor is entitled to no special privileges.
3. Wages vary with efficiency.

4. Skilled labor has approved of minimum wage in Victoria, where tried.

Therefore, a minimum wage scale will be just to skilled labor.

Now I shall prove to you, Honorable Judges, that —

A minimum wage scale will be just to employers, because:

1. A minimum wage scale will protect fair employers from unfair competition.

2. Living wages mean better service.

3. No employer is entitled to a human subsidy.

Consider my first sub-point — A minimum wage scale will protect fair employers from unfair competitors. Opponents of the minimum wage make much of the employers who will be driven out of business. In reality such a fact will be a blessing. Employers who have conscientiously sought to pay adequate wages have been forced to compete with these avaricious parasites of industry. Allow that employers who will not pay a living wage will be put out of business, and fair employers will remain subject to fair competition.

My second sub-point — Living wages mean better service. Sidney Webb, before quoted, says: "To put it plumply, if the employers paid more, the labor would be worth more." H. La Rue Brown, chairman of the Massachusetts minimum wage committee, has said,—"No man can say how many of the girls now said to be inefficient and 'not worth' the miserable wages paid would not be worth a higher wage if they were paid it."

Mr. Greenway, a merchant of Wichita, has a minimum

wage of seven dollars in force for his clerk service. Mr. Greenway stated to one of our girls that the higher wage is largely met by increased service. Spirit and ambition are stimulated — living wages mean better service.

Consider my third sub-point — No employer is entitled to a human subsidy. The Massachusetts Commission, in its report of January, 1912, stated — “If an industry is permanently dependent for its existence on underpaid labor, its value to the commonwealth is questionable.” Concerning parasitic industries, Webb, before quoted, says — “If the workers thus used up were horses, as, for instance, on the horse cars of an old street railway, the employers would have to provide in addition to a daily modicum of food, shelter and rest, the whole cost of breeding and training the successive relays necessary to keep up their establishments. In the case of free human beings who are not purchased by the employer this capital value of the new generation of workers is placed gratuitously at his disposal on payment merely of subsistence from day to day.” In other words we raise horseflesh to sell on the market, but we rear a new generation of human flesh with which to subsidize parasitic industry. The relative worth of a human being and a horse makes it preposterous to think that any employer is ever entitled to a human subsidy. Honorable Judges, note I have shown to you that:

1. A minimum wage will protect fair employers from unfair competition.
2. Living wages mean better service.
3. No employer is entitled to a human subsidy. There-

fore, a minimum wage scale will be just to employers.

Further, a minimum wage scale will be just to the public.

1. The public will not necessarily be affected by minimum wage.

2. The public has a moral obligation to producers.

3. A minimum wage is real economy to the public.

Let us take up my first sub-point — The public will not necessarily be affected by minimum wage. To be sure, if wages are raised, the amount of the raise must come from some source. But there are at least three possible sources: Higher cost of product to public, decreased profits to the employer, or in the greater efficiency, and better organization of industry so as to lower cost of production. With two other possible sources in view we can say that the public will not necessarily be affected, and with free competition a raise in prices will usually be the last resort.

My second sub-point — The public has a moral obligation to producers. The industrial producers provide the necessities of life for the public. The public has no possible moral right to live on the labor of others without at the same time providing the necessities of life for those who minister to its needs.

My third sub-point — A minimum wage scale will be real economy for the public. H. La Rue Brown, before quoted, makes the following statements concerning the business end of a minimum wage: "Cold business reasons demand the change. You pay more for that for which you pay indirectly. Now as a proposition in

mathematics,— If a girl must spend eight dollars to keep alive and reasonably efficient, and she only gets six dollars, the difference is being accounted for in some other way. It may be accounted for in the millions spent in public and private charity. It may be accounted for in the stretching of the meager earnings of another so that some industry supports, not only its own labor, but also part of the other. More frequently we pay in a yet more wasteful, terrible way for them, we pay in the most valuable asset society can have, in the health and strength and shattered nerves.”

Even if the increased wages involved should come directly from the public at large, although I have shown that this would not be necessary, it would then be cheaper for the public than to maintain the charities and their organizations which must meet the industrial deficit in its provision for laborers.

Having proved to you, Honorable Judges, that:

1. The public will not necessarily be affected by a minimum wage scale.

2. The public has moral obligations to producers.

3. A minimum wage will be real economy to the public.

I contend that a minimum wage scale will be just to the public.

My colleague has shown you that present labor wages are unjust, and that a minimum wage scale will remove this injustice. I have shown further that a minimum wage scale will be just to skilled labor, to employers, and to the public.

I shall turn to my second main point —

II. A minimum wage scale will simplify social problems.

It will do this for three reasons:

1. It will separate dependents.
2. It will decrease child labor.
3. It will tend to lessen degeneracy.

1. It will separate dependents. Much argument has been directed against the minimum wage upon the ground that many who cannot earn the minimum wage will be deprived of work. It stands to reason that under any regular work, aside from piecework, the more efficient will secure the labor. Professor Hammond, of Ohio State University, a thorough student and a friend of the minimum wage, says, "the legal minimum wage does unquestionably force out of employment sooner than would otherwise be the case, a certain number of old, infirm and naturally slow workers." Honorable Judges, this is in reality a blessing — the inefficients will stand out clearly as dependents and can be dealt with by the government accordingly. My third sub-point will show the advantage of this fact.

Now the consideration of my second sub-point: It will decrease child labor. This is true because there will be less need for the children's contribution to the support of the family when the father is able to earn a living wage. And further, it will be more difficult for children to secure work under a minimum wage scale, for competition will eliminate the least efficient as I have already shown.

My third sub-point is: It will tend to lessen degeneracy. Because normal workers will no longer have to

meet the inefficients in competition for wages but can get a living wage for themselves. H. La Rue Brown says—"There is nothing which makes for inefficiency like hunger, worry, and discontent." The partial support of all under free competition tends to half support and corrupts all alike, according to Webb, who states, "Because (labor) is distributed as partial employment and partial maintenance among the entire class, its insufficiency and irregularity demoralize all alike, and render whole sections of the population of the great cities of the twentieth century permanently incapable of regular conduct and continuous work. Thus the disease perpetuates itself and becomes by its very vastness, incapable of being isolated and treated." Then, too, fewer women will have to assist their husbands in the struggle for existence when a normal man can earn a living wage. And yet if a woman must work she can get a just wage for her labor.

Jane Addams, in her book—"Spirit of Youth and the City Streets," says: "Fourteen of the great European powers protect women from all night work or from excessive labor by day because paternalistic governments prize the strength of women for the bearing and rearing of healthy children to the state." Honorable Judges, a legislation which will provide a living for normal workers, give more children an opportunity for a childhood and education, and conserve the vitality of a nation's motherhood, must tend to lessen degeneracy.

Now, Honorable Judges, I have shown to you that a minimum wage scale will:

1. Separate dependents.

2. Decrease child labor.
3. Tend to lessen degeneracy.

Therefore, a minimum wage scale will simplify social problems.

In conclusion, Honorable Judges, let me restate the two main points of my argument. A minimum wage scale will be just to skilled labor, employers, and the public. A minimum wage scale will simplify social problems.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, JOHN M. MICHENER, FRIENDS
UNIVERSITY

Honorable Judges, Opponents, Ladies and Gentlemen: The minimum wage is not a panacea for all the economic ills of our industrial society. Its only purpose is to provide a living wage for the normal worker, while employed. The purpose of the affirmative is to show that the minimum wage will do this one thing and also will be accompanied by no great inherent evils.

My colleagues have shown that the minimum wage will provide a living wage for the normal worker and will bring no injustice. My first colleague has shown that present labor wages are unjust, and that the minimum wage will remove this injustice. My second colleague has shown that a minimum wage scale is just to skilled labor, employers and the public, and that the minimum wage scale will simplify social problems. I will show that the main objections to the minimum wage scale are problems of adjustment, not inherent evils.

Since it is new, many objections are raised against the minimum wage scale. My opponents, for instance, have

said that the minimum wage scale will not reach the class for which it is intended. To answer that objection and other objections, is my purpose. Three main objections have been made to the scale: (1) Subnormal workers are not provided for. (2) The minimum will become the maximum. (3) It cannot be enforced. Let us answer these objections in the order given.

(1) Subnormal workers are not provided for. By this is meant the aged, those defective mentally, morally, or physically, and the apprentices.

My opponents argue something like this: the minimum wage scale sets a minimum wage for everybody in a trade. The employer will not hire any one whom he thinks is incapable of as efficient work as the normal workers. The aged, the defectives, and the apprentices are not as efficient, therefore the employer will not hire them. My opponents, however, are wrong in their premise. The minimum wage scale does not set a minimum wage for everybody, both normal and subnormal in a trade, but it sets a minimum wage for the normal worker making a normal production. Any person giving the normal production must receive the minimum wage, when hired. All subnormal workers, and the aged, the defectives and the apprentices are subnormal workers, are allowed subnormal wages. The normal worker will earn the minimum wage. The subnormals cannot earn the minimum wage and, since justice is our purpose, we do not intend to give them the minimum wage. Such subnormals as can work will be provided for in one of two ways. In trades where piecework is established the price would be

the basis of pay. The subnormals would simply do less work, and so, receive less pay. There would be no more reason for discharging them after the minimum wage was established than before. In other trades, permits can be granted to these subnormals to work at less than the minimum wage.

Moreover, the giving of permits to subnormals to receive subnormal wages is in all the minimum wage laws. This provision is in the Victorian law and the laws of the eight states of the United States that have minimum wage laws. The number of these permits can be, and is, limited so that no abuse can be made of this privilege. Special provision is also made for apprentices. They are treated as a class of subnormals. Those workers who cannot obtain work at any wage would naturally be those who ought to be public charges. The minimum scale will reveal them. This is one of the simplifications of the social problem of which my second colleague has treated. Thus you see that subnormal workers are provided for, as employers are allowed and can afford to hire them at a wage below the minimum. Therefore, the first main objection to the minimum wage scale is simply one of adjustment, for the subnormals are provided for.

The second objection to the minimum wage scale is that the minimum will become the maximum. My opponents base their proof of this objection on two considerations: First, the employer will reduce all wages to the minimum, and second, the laborer, assured of a living, will make no effort to be efficient. Both these suppositions are absolutely false. The first consideration is based on the con-

sideration that employers pay as low as possible. If that is so, employers pay as low as possible now. Wages are as low as employers can now make them. The minimum wage will not help the employer to lower the wages. The second consideration, that the laborer is assured of a living, is wrong. The minimum wage simply guarantees the worker a living wage. Competition will not be affected in the least. The man who becomes indifferent, or lazy and relies on the minimum wage, will lose his job. The efficient man will be rewarded for his efficiency and his reward will increase with his efficiency.

Mr. M. B. Hammond says: "The determinations (of the boards in Australia) do not compel an employer to hire or to retain in employment any worker. He is free to dismiss any man whom he believes incapable of earning the minimum wage. There seems to be no reason why, under this system, there should not be the same competition among employers as under the old system to secure the most efficient and highly skilled men and there is no reason why men should not get wages based on their superior efficiency. In New Zealand statistics of 1909 showed that in four leading industrial centers, fifty-one to sixty-one per cent. of the workmen received more than the minimum wage. There is no reason to think that a dissimilar situation would be revealed by a statistical investigation in Victoria."

In 1898, two years after the establishment of the minimum wage law in Victoria, Mr. Peacock, chief secretary of Victoria, said: "It had been predicted that the minimum would become the maximum, but this was not so.

There were 1,749 males last week in one hundred eleven factories. Of these, four hundred thirty-nine or twenty-five per cent. were paid forty-five shillings or more; one hundred fifteen, forty to forty-five shillings; and two hundred twenty-one were on piecework, leaving nine hundred seventy-four who were getting from thirty-six to forty shillings — at that time thirty-six shillings was the minimum wage." According to Professor Seager, of the University of Pennsylvania, in the clothing trade in Victoria, under the minimum wage act, the average wage for men is eight shillings six pence above the minimum; for women, six shillings three pence. The same is true of the boot, furniture and shirt making trades. Honorable Judges, is not my opponent's objection false? The minimum wage should not, and does not become the maximum.

Now for the third main objection to the minimum wage scale — that the minimum wage scale cannot be enforced. In the first place, the minimum wage is being enforced in Australia and the tendency is for it to spread all over the world. Therefore, when my opponents make this objection, the burden of proof is with them on this point. They must base their opinion on something definite. Their reasons for this objection are about as follows:

- (1) Wages are regulated by the economic laws of production and of supply and demand, and statutory law, such as the minimum wage, cannot conflict with these.
- (2) The minimum wage scale will not be successful in the United States, because of the size of the United

States and of the diverse nationalities and trades in the United States.

My opponents have said that wages ought to be based on production and on supply and demand. My colleague has shown that no industry has a right to exist that does not pay its normal workers a living wage. Now with the exception of those parasitic industries, all others can afford to pay a living wage and still make production the basis of wages. The minimum wage then makes no effort to change the basis. It will drive out unworthy parasitic industries, and it will hinder unfair bargaining. It will not change the economic basis. It will allow the law of supply and demand to regulate all wages above this minimum. Therefore, the minimum wage is not in conflict with these two economic laws.

But my opponents have said that the United States is such a large country and has so many nationalities and trades in it, that the minimum wage scale cannot be enforced. Let me say here, that the phrase, "Through appropriate legislation," means all laws necessary or appropriate to enable Congress to establish a minimum wage scale in the United States.

The minimum wage has been in force in Victoria, Australia, for eighteen years. If it can be enforced there, it can be enforced in the United States. My colleague has shown that it is successful there. Let us quote two more authorities. H. W. Macrosty, of the London School of Economics, says in regard to Victoria, "The general opinion of the employers after the ex-

perience of the new conditions is that they would not return to the old." M. B. Hammond, also speaking of Victoria, says, "The trade unionists generally admit that labor has been greatly benefited by the wage boards legislation and they do not desire a repeal of those laws." But my opponents have said conditions are so different that the minimum wage would not be successful in the United States. But are they? The United States is large, Victoria is not as large, but it is only a difference of degree. The United States is an industrial nation. Most of the land in Victoria is owned by a few families. Business is mostly industrial and the minimum wage has only been applied to industrial pursuits. Conditions are not different in this respect. The United States has many nationalities in it. So has Victoria. Besides European races, she has the Chinese, the Japanese, the Kanakas, the Hindus and the aborigines, with all of whom it is much harder to deal than with the foreign races in the United States. Are conditions different? But opponents say that the minimum wage has only been tried in times of prosperity. Listen to what Sidney Webb, of London University, an authority on this question, said in 1912: "The (minimum wage) act was tested by the not inconsiderable period of sixteen years, extending over years of relative trade depression as well as over years of boom."

Scott Nearing, instructor in political economy at the University of Pennsylvania, says in his book, "Social Adjustment," "Victoria has passed and is passing through economic stages similar to those existing in vari-

ous parts of the United States at the present time,—unemployment aggravated by immigration formed as serious a problem in Victoria as it does in the United States at the present time." Honorable Judges, there are no differences, vital to this question, in conditions between the United States and Victoria. The conditions in the United States differ from those in Victoria, only in degree not in quality. Therefore, we believe that the minimum wage scale can be enforced, (1) because the minimum wage scale is not in conflict with, but is in accord with the economic laws of Production and of Supply and Demand; (2) because the necessary legislation is possible; and (3) because conditions in the United States differ only in degree from those of Victoria, where the minimum wage is successful.

Now, Honorable Judges, I have shown that; (1) Sub-normal workers are provided for by the minimum wage scale. (2) The minimum wage will not become the maximum. (3) The minimum wage scale can be enforced. Therefore, our fifth point that the main objections to the minimum wage scale are problems of adjustment, has been established.

Now, Honorable Judges, this ends our main argument. Let me give you a summary of our argument. My first colleague, in the introduction, has shown that the method of obtaining the minimum wage is eliminated by the phrase, "Through appropriate legislation," in our question. He has also defined the minimum wage as a living wage based on the normal production of a normal worker. My opponents have accepted our introduction. My first

colleague established two main points. He showed, (1) that present labor wages are unjust, first because bargaining and not production is the practical basis of our wage system and second, because many laborers do not now receive a living wage. He also showed (2) that the minimum wage scale will remove this injustice, first because production will determine the lower limit of wages, second, because all normal workers will receive at least a living wage. My second colleague has also established two main points. He showed that the minimum wage scale is just to (1) skilled labor, (2) the employer and, (3) the public. He also showed that the minimum wage scale will simplify social problems, first, because it will separate dependents, second, because it will decrease child labor, and third, because it will tend to lessen degeneracy. I closed the argument by showing that the main objections to the minimum wage scale are matters of adjustment. I did so by refuting the three main objections to the minimum wage scale. Therefore the five main points of the affirmative are:

- (1) Present labor wages are unjust.
- (2) The minimum wage scale will remove this injustice.
- (3) The minimum wage scale is just to skilled labor, the employer and the public.
- (4) The minimum wage scale will simplify social problems.
- (5) The main objections to the minimum wage scale are matters of adjustment, therefore we of the affirmative believe in the affirmative of the question, resolved,

that through appropriate legislation, a minimum wage scale should be put into operation in the United States.

FRIENDS UNIVERSITY vs. FAIRMOUNT COLLEGE

FIRST NEGATIVE, CHARLES HILL, FRIENDS UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question we are discussing to-night is not an issue between labor and capital. We, of the negative, admit that there are some evils in the industrial world, but we deny that there are any general evils that are due to the present wage system. We are friends of labor as much as our opponents. The champion of the minimum wage is not necessarily the champion of the cause of labor.

The burden of proof in this debate is with the affirmative. They must prove three things: (1) That poverty, due to low wages, is extensive enough to justify general governmental action. (2) That the minimum wage is a sound governmental policy, correct in principle. (3) That the scheme can be put into successful operation in the United States. The affirmative must prove all of these three propositions.

The negative may prove any one of three counter propositions: (1) that poverty, due to low wages is not extensive enough to justify general government action. (2) That the minimum wage is unsound as a governmental policy. (3) That it cannot be put into successful

operation in the United States. We claim your decision if we prove any one of these three propositions. I shall now take up the first of these counter propositions.

My first main point is that present conditions do not warrant this drastic measure. We support this contention by two considerations: (1) The majority of workers now receive a comfortable living. (2) This measure is too drastic. We are debating the advisability of adopting a new governmental policy. Special interference is justifiable only when there is special need. There should be no change of policy unless the disorder is general. We admit that there are some instances where laborers, because of combines, etc., do not get a just proportion of the wealth produced, but we maintain that the majority of workers now receive a comfortable living.

1. Statistics prove this. Statistics from the United States Census report show that, on the average, wage-earners in manufacturing industries receive \$518 a year. This excludes apprentices, children and unmarried people. All males over 16 get \$580 a year. Heads of families receive an average of \$600 a year. These statistics are authoritative. Do my opponents deny that this sum is a living wage? I quote from the United States Department of Labor Bulletin. It refers to an investigation of 2,567 wage earning families in factory towns in the East. The average number of members in the family was five and one-third. The average annual income was \$827. It is evident that statistics show that the majority of wage earners receive a living wage.

2. Prominent authorities say they receive a living

wage. Henry B. Seager, professor of political economy in Columbia University, says, "In the United States today, the great majority of our industries pay living wages to the great majority of the workers in their employ." My opponents may cite instances where living wages are not paid, but we challenge them to show that the majority do not now receive a living wage.

In the second place this measure is too drastic, first because there is no economic source for its inception. The most natural source is capital. Capital, however, is not able to pay a minimum wage. Here is a New York Exchange report. It lists eighty-five different kinds of bonds. They pay from three and one-half to six per cent. The average is four and one-half per cent. Fifty-nine out of the eighty-five sell above 90; the other stocks are lower. The Pennsylvania Railroad, the best road in the United States, paid last year only five per cent. on preferred stock and three per cent. on common stock. The average profit of capital in the United States is about four per cent. In Wichita, five per cent. bonds sell at 101, four and one-half school bonds at par. The average for bonds is four and one-half. Here is a letter from the First National Bank of Boston. It says, "Money on call during the past month has been plentiful and rates during that period have declined from four and one-half to three per cent. Much interest is focused on the forthcoming issue of \$45,000,000 corporate stock by the corporation of the City of New York on a four and one-half basis, the highest price ever paid for money by the metropolis."

I have shown that capital is paying four per cent. interest on investments, bonds are paying four and one-half, and stocks less. A fair average is not over four per cent. Considering losses and risks, I think my opponents will agree that three per cent. is not an exorbitant profit. If all above three per cent. went to labor, it would get but one per cent. Government statistics show that there is \$1,850 capital invested for each laborer. Then the laborer would get but \$18.50 per year more than they do now. Is it wise to adopt the minimum wage with its attendant evils for such a small possible increase in wages? I maintain that the possible increase in wages does not warrant such a drastic measure as the minimum wage.

This measure is too drastic in the second place because there is no provision for hard times. In times of business depression, employers would be driven out of business. Then trusts and combines would be the natural result. Third, we dare not use compulsion. Is it safe to compel by law a minimum wage scale? This is a new policy; it is foreign to our principles. The value of such minimum wage laws as we now have can often be traced to an investigation of a committee or to the better understanding between employer and employee the agitation and investigation caused. All this is well. We are in sympathy with investigation and arbitration. We believe that the right relationship may be secured without resort to actual compulsion. The investigations in Massachusetts, for instance, have been of value. If we have success without resort to compulsion, surely compulsion is

wrong and we do not want a legal minimum wage scale in the United States.

Let me summarize my first point. I have shown (1) that present conditions do not warrant this drastic measure, for the majority of workers now receive a living wage, also because the measure is too drastic since there is no source for its rise, no provision for hard times, and since we dare not use compulsion.

I shall now proceed with my second main point that the minimum wage would not reach the class for which it is intended. I have already shown that a majority of wage-earners now receive a comfortable living. Their wages are now above the minimum wage. Then, the minimum wage must be for the minority. This minority is unskilled labor. Skilled workmen do not need it and so do not want it. Does even the friend of the minimum wage hope that it will be applied to miscellaneous labor? Think of the stupendous difficulty of operation. The production of all the factories would have to be taken into consideration. Living expenses would have to be investigated by experts. Moreover, the value of labor varies with supply and demand, change of seasons, etc. The task would be practically impossible. Moreover, wages increase, or rather should increase, in proportion to the need. And then, skilled workmen are easily estimated because of their organization, but the difficulty is greatly increased among the unskilled workmen.

My opponents say that the standard is the normal production of the normal man. The normal man does not exist, however. These averages are on paper, not

in real life. Where the need is the greatest, the scheme breaks down. Here is the situation for my opponents. The vast majority of laborers now receive a living wage; the scale cannot be applied to miscellaneous labor; there is a little group somewhere between the two marked off by a shadow line. For this small group the minimum wage is applicable.

I wish to prove, first, that only a small amount of poverty is caused by low wages. Certainly, the minimum wage will not cure poverty not caused by low wages. Listen! Only 3.15 per cent. of the poverty in five of the largest cities in the United States is caused by low wages. It is these very cities where the conditions are not ideal. For this small amount, we are to have the minimum wage. Again, the causes of poverty are numerous. Careless management is one. Our foreign population is the most poverty-stricken and yet their living expenses are the least. High wages would not help them. Illiteracy is another cause. One-tenth of the population of the United States is illiterate. Most of these illiterates are among the working classes. A third cause is unemployment, which is due to sickness, accident, inefficiency, seasonal trades, industrial crises, etc. Statistics show that there are 5,227,000 unemployed males in the United States. Nearly 3,000,000 of them are unemployed on an average one-fourth of the full working time. The minimum wage will not benefit the unemployed by the very nature of the proposition. A fourth cause is congestion in the cities. People are flocking from the country to the city. My opponents will doubtless give

statistics from the largest cities where the congestion is the worst. A fifth cause is intoxicating liquor. Two and one-half billion dollars was spent last year for strong drink — most of it by laborers. It causes poverty in two ways: it takes the money and it reduces efficiency. The minimum wage will not affect these five greatest causes of poverty among workmen.

I wish to prove in the second place that the minimum wage is very difficult of operation. First, the minimum wage is too inelastic. Now a wage scale will have to be very elastic. There is a lack of uniformity in unskilled labor. Men vary in their capacity for work. Some men can do twice as much as others. Moreover, the value of labor varies according to location. A laborer could save more money in Wichita on \$10 a week than in Los Angeles at \$15. Again, the cost of living varies from year to year. The worker would have to spend more money in the North for clothing than in the South. At certain times of the year labor is more valuable than at other times. There is in the United States a conglomeration of forty-six nationalities and consequently nearly as many different standards of living. The minimum wage must apply to all ages, men, women, children. Heads of families having greater expenses should have greater wages on the living wage basis. A family of ten should receive more than a family of five. An American family should receive more than a Chinese family. Furthermore, women and children should have wage standards separate from those of men. If they received the same minimum wage as the men, they would be thrown out

of employment. Honorable Judges, this question resolves itself into one which involves an individual minimum wage for every section of the country. It must vary with the seasons and also with every city, every industry, every nationality and both sexes. Finally, it must vary with every different class of people. It would require the services of an enormous number of expert men. The expense would be far greater than the service rendered. My opponents say, "Take an average." Yes, take an average! In the first place, it would be impossible to do this; in the second place, it would not greatly benefit those who now receive above the average; and, lastly, it would not be a scientific minimum wage. Honorable Judges, I challenge my opponents to prove that a minimum wage scale can be put into successful operation in the United States.

A further difficulty would be encountered in the fact that the wage earners themselves are fighting the minimum wage with all their power. The American Federation of Labor, voicing the sentiment of the wage earners of America, is unalterably opposed to the minimum wage. Samuel Gompers, its president, says, "I do not favor the governmental enactment of a living wage for wage earners in private employ. I recognize the danger of such a proposition." The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor says, "If it were proposed in this country to invest authority in any tribunal to fix wages by law, labor would protest with every means in its power." Yet my opponents would thrust upon the American workmen a scheme which he does not want.

In the words of Edward F. McSweeney, a member of the Massachusetts Industrial Accident board, "This proposed legal minimum wage is a sample of the kind of law which wherever passed in any age has historically failed to establish amicable relations between capital and labor. When, as in this case, laws result in uninvited legal interference in industry, they have inevitably been followed by political, economic, and social disorder." My opponents have attempted the impossible, to make water run up hill, to weave ropes out of sand.

Honorable Judges, under my second main point, namely, that the minimum wage would not reach the class for which it is intended, I have proved that poverty is not due to the present wage scale, that the minimum wage scale would be difficult of operation because it is inelastic and because the workmen oppose it. I have proved, then, that the present industrial conditions do not warrant this drastic measure, and that the minimum wage would not reach the class for which it is intended. Therefore, I maintain that a minimum wage scale should not be put into operation in the United States.

SECOND NEGATIVE, HAYDEN KERSHNER, FRIENDS
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The whole proposition of the legal minimum wage rests on a false premise, for (a) wages are beyond the control of law, and (b) the minimum wage rests on a wrong economic basis.

First, wages are beyond the control of law. Law has

a distinct realm of its own and wages are entirely beyond its control. Wages are controlled by supply and demand. Supply and demand are great economic forces. Because of a complication of other forces supply and demand can be controlled no more directly than the tides can be controlled by legislation. The economic machinery of this country is so intricate in its mechanism and is so far-reaching in its ramifications that the mind of no one man can grasp it in its entirety. Any arbitrary attempt to alter one part will send disturbing influences throughout the whole with far-reaching consequences that may not be foreseen.

If wages are increased, the money must come from somewhere. There are but three possible sources: sales must be increased, prices must be advanced, or profits must be cut down. Let us consider these three possibilities:

1. Sales increased. Presumably sales are at a maximum at the present time, or at least every attempt is being made to make them so. If they are, the money can not come from that source.

2. Advanced prices. Advance prices and you cut down sales. This is a well known business truth. When you cause sales to fall off, workmen must be discharged. So this method harms labor more than it helps.

3. Reduced profits. There were in the United States last year 15,213 business failures. If business is conducted on such a small margin that over 15,000 concerns were forced out in one year, what would happen if that small margin of profit was reduced? Every failure, re-

member, means loss of employment for labor. My opponents assume that most business pays large dividends. This is a mistake. My colleague proved to you that the great bulk of business in the country is conducted on a small margin of profit. Cut down that small margin of profit and you will bring disaster to business. Factories will close and capital will leave the country. People will invest in foreign countries or hoard their money. This would be disastrous to labor. So all three plans fail. It is worse than useless to try to increase wages by law.

When any reform is needed, a certain class of people always want a law on the subject. Legislation is their propaganda and law their panacea for all ills. Law is the will of society. To seek to remedy social and economic evils by law is to apply Christian Science to the state. Law has a realm of its own and some things are entirely beyond its control. Wages are clearly so.

Government meddling in economic affairs is no new thing. Back in 1839 the English parliament passed the famous Statute of Laborers. This law was designed to regulate wages. It did far more harm than good and was soon repealed. Then the government tried to regulate prices but with no better success. In 1815 Parliament again tried to regulate prices, but completely failed to alleviate conditions. Such laws are short sighted and are always harmful, because they deal with forces entirely beyond the control of law.

Our own colonial history furnishes some fine examples of legislation of this character. The Puritans of New England firmly believed that all affairs, both public and

private, economic and social, could be regulated by law. In 1633 the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed a statute regulating wages. The law proved an absolute failure and was repealed in two years. A new law was passed giving each town authority to regulate wages within its jurisdiction. This also failed and was soon repealed. I could give many more examples of this character. New England statesmen, after repeated failures, finally saw that social and economic forces were beyond the control of law. Are we going to be foolish enough to repeat their mistakes? That is exactly what our opponents propose. Honorable Judges, can it be wise to disregard the experience of the past?

But let us come down to the present. Take our usury for example. We fix six per cent. as the legal rate. According to my opponents' theory every man who wants money can get it at six per cent. On the contrary the man whose security is a little doubtful can not get it at all at six per cent. whereas he might get it at eight, ten, or twelve, but these are illegal. The law, then, instead of helping the poor borrower and protecting him actually prevents him from getting money. In like manner a minimum wage, instead of helping the low paid would throw him out of employment. Law can not compel a man to hire labor at a certain price any more than it can compel him to lend his money at a certain rate. Every one knows that the spirit of the usury laws is not and can not be enforced. I maintain that a minimum wage law would suffer the same fate. The man who has plenty of money can always get money at a low rate, and

so does not need the law. The poor man must pay a high rate in spite of the law, so the laws fails of its design. So it will be with the minimum wage. The man who is worth a high wage will get it without the law. The man who is not worth it can not get it by the aid of the law. So the law does no good. These examples I have sighted prove that it is worse than useless to try to fix wages by law.

I have mentioned supply and demand as the controlling factors in bargaining. My opponents say that present conditions place labor at the mercy of capital, and thus prevent bargaining from working out in accord with the laws of supply and demand. In other words conditions are unnatural and present wages are the result. By this reasoning my opponents admit that under normal conditions wages would adjust themselves. Then why not change the unnatural conditions. Is it not better to remedy causes than to seek to alter results? Present industrial conditions are the causes. Wages are the results. The minimum wage strikes at the results and leaves the causes untouched. It is, therefore, a wrong and unworkable method.

Now, in the second place, the minimum wage proposition rests on a false premise because it puts wages on a wrong economic basis. What determines wages? Professor Ely says, "Wages constitute the price paid for the services of labor." "They are prices paid for particular kinds of service, and hence come under the general laws of supply and demand." "The demand for labor is in the last analysis the demand for the services of labor."

"Labor does not command a price of its own." Labor is valuable only as its products are valuable. Hence wages should be determined by production.

My opponents, however, would set up a double standard. They assert that wages should be based on production but at the same time they base their argument for a minimum wage on poverty and the need of an increase in wages. They also say that the minimum wage must be a living wage. This clearly makes need the basis. There can not be two diverse standards for determining wages. A man with a family certainly needs more than a single man. Yet in actual production the single man may be ahead. Here the two standards conflict. Clearly, then, this double standard is not a tenable basis for adjusting wages.

For the sake of argument, though, suppose we make need the basis. The cost of living varies in different parts of the country. Standards of living vary through a wide range. Whose need is to determine the wage scale? To adjust wages according to need is impossible. Need is no criterion of worth. Wages must be determined by production and standards of living must be regulated accordingly. The only way a man can raise his standard of living is to increase his worth. I fully agree with my opponents that no man should be deprived of the products of his own labor. But the minimum wage is a wrong method because it puts wages on a wrong basis. You can not cure any evil by a method which is fundamentally wrong.

I have now shown you that wages are beyond the con-

trol of law, and that the minimum wage puts wages on a wrong economic basis. These two relations establish our third main point, that the whole proposition of a legal minimum wage rests on false premises.

The social and economic forces of our country are interlocked and bound together into one huge system. This system is big, its workings so complicated, its parts so interdependent, that any tampering with one part sends disturbing influences throughout the whole. Much evil is often caused by men of high motives. The worst enemy of reform is the ignorant, erratic, would-be reformer. In attempting to improve one part he disturbs other parts. Such will be the case with the minimum wage. In attempting to improve one condition, disturbance will be set up that will cause more harm than the evil it is proposed to remedy.

My colleague has shown you that the minimum wage will not improve the conditions for which it is designed. I shall now show you some of the evils it will cause. First, the minimum wage will increase the flow of country girls to the cities. One of the biggest problems of social workers to-day is that of taking care of the country girls who go to the cities. A legal minimum wage will aggravate this problem in two ways: First, it will act as a bait attracting more girls to the cities. Second, if we compel employers to pay higher wages they will be obliged to reduce the number of employees. This will throw many girls out of employment. These two causes will greatly increase the army of destitute, unemployed girls. Bad as it is to be in a city living on a

low wage, it is infinitely worse to be in a big city without money and without work. I agree with my opponents that something should be done to help girls in industry, but a legal minimum wage is not the proper remedy of conditions, because, as I have shown, it increases the drift into cities, throws many out of employment, and greatly increases the distress and temptations of working girls.

Second, a minimum wage will increase undesirable immigration. The greatest menace to American labor is the yearly influx of low class, unskilled labor. Offer the attraction of a legal minimum wage and this immigration will greatly increase. My opponents say that under a minimum wage the employers will prefer to employ Americans. Then these immigrants will add to the army of the unemployed, already a national menace. A minimum wage will increase immigration and congest the labor market. These evils are far more serious than the one the minimum wage is designed to remedy.

Third, a minimum wage will lower the standard of efficiency. State regulation of wages takes away the spur of competition. Men who are protected by the state soon come to rely on the state instead of upon their own efforts. Such an attitude can not help lowering efficiency. Protection always fosters carelessness and irresponsibility. It breeds a spirit of dependence, destroys self-reliance and makes children of men. These things are bound to lower efficiency.

Mr. Earnest Aves, an expert sent by the British parliament to investigate conditions in New Zealand and Australia, reported that the standard of efficiency had fallen

off since the minimum wage was put into effect. An American professor of economics after an extensive study of conditions in Australia, says, "I found that most employers with whom I talked were certain that laborers were less efficient than in former years." So you see both theory and practice prove that a legal minimum wage lowers the standard of efficiency.

Fourth, under the minimum wage law, there is a tendency for all wages to be reduced to the minimum. In four leading industrial centers in Australia, statistics show that forty-five per cent. of workers receive the minimum. Workmen are not uniform. If labor is scarce an employer in order to get his work done will be obliged to hire men who are not worth the minimum wage. To balance this loss he will reduce the wages of men who are worth more than the minimum. There is nothing to prevent an employer from reducing wages to the minimum. The law can not prevent it, and the workers' most powerful weapon, the strike, is rendered useless. The success of a strike depends on public sympathy. When Congress or some board on wages declares a certain rate to be a reasonable, living wage, the public will have very little sympathy for any class of men who strike for a higher wage. A strike will fail through lack of public support. A legal minimum wage tends to reduce wages to the minimum.

Fifth, a legal minimum wage deprives the workers of their power to defend their rights. I have just shown that strikes will be ineffective. When wages are controlled by law, all depends on the political influence and

you know that in that field capital is stronger than labor. The *Forum* magazine in speaking of the minimum wage in Australia says, "The truth is that the trade unions have lost, to a great extent, their power of fighting for what they consider their rights." Again in the same paper there is the statement that "in the United States trade agreements have secured living wages to a greater degree than has been done in Australia through law." No wonder the American Federation of Labor is opposed to the legal minimum wage. Minimum wage laws harm the laboring people more than they benefit them.

Sixth, a minimum wage law interferes with the right of contract. Labor is produce. It is what the laborer has to sell. The state has no more right to interfere to fix the price that he shall receive than it has to fix the price of any other commodity. Prices are fixed by bargaining between buyer and seller. The laborer is a seller. If the state fixes the price of his labor it takes away his bargaining power, a thing it has no right to do. To do so is to assert that the laborer does not own his own labor, which is an absolutely false premise.

Seventh, a minimum wage will not help the unemployed, but, as my colleague showed, will increase their number. I want to call the special attention of the judges to this point. Our opponents base a large part of their plea for a minimum wage on the poverty and need of the unskilled, what is known as the lowest class of labor. Much of the poverty of this class is due to unemployment. By no manner of reasoning can the minimum wage be construed to furnish work for the unemployed.

Thus the minimum wage will entirely fail to accomplish the chief end for which it is wanted.

I have now shown you six serious evils which the minimum wage will cause. My opponents advocate an untried measure, entailing all these evils, all for a doubtful benefit to a minority of workers. Honorable Judges, can this be a wise step?

THIRD NEGATIVE, HOWARD KERSHNER, FRIENDS
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The minimum wage is based on a fundamentally wrong theory of government, the paternalistic theory. Paternalism is a patronizing, protective attitude on the part of the government that assumes the right to pry into and regulate the affairs of its citizens. The object of government is to insure justice and order. The best government secures these ends with the least possible amount of interference with personal liberty. The paternalistic theory advocates extensive regulation of private affairs.

The evils of such a theory of government are many. Paternalism stifles the true spirit of freedom and develops a race of dependent, servile men. Men who rely on the government instead of upon themselves become dispirited, weak and lifeless. Paternalism takes away self-reliance, dignity, boldness, daring and all the noble qualities of real manhood.

That paternalism is dangerous can not be denied by any student of history. Rome furnishes a fine example of

its degrading effects. Compare Republic Rome with Imperial Rome. During the republic we find a sturdy, self-reliant people and a capable, efficient government. Now look at Imperial Rome after paternalism has come in. Instead of serving the government all are trying to see who can get the most out of government. The sturdy self-reliant people are a servile mob living on free grain, the bounty of the government, and fawning at the feet of tyranny. The government is full of graft, corruption and decay. Honorable Judges, a legal minimum wage is a step in the same direction. I challenge my opponents to contradict this statement and prove their contention. Paternalism teaches people to rely on favor and bounty of the government rather than on their own efforts. My opponents say conditions have changed. True! But human nature has not changed. The same influences that made a Roman degenerate will make an American degenerate. If this nation is to endure, we must profit by the mistakes of the past. Paternalism is one of the worst of these mistakes. We must avoid this pitfall.

France furnishes another example of the evil effects of paternalism. The French are naturally an energetic, high spirited people, but paternalism has robbed them of the qualities of independence and self-assertion, which are so necessary to build and maintain governments. Paternalism has held back the naturally brilliant French people until to-day France is a second rate power. In England independence has advanced a people to the front rank of civilization and to the control of one-fourth the inhabitable area of the globe. Honorable Judges, do we Ameri-

cans want to reject a policy that has made us what we are and adopt a policy that has failed everywhere? If not, then let us avoid the minimum wage for the basic principle of a legal minimum wage is paternalism.

Now turn to Germany. The German government has always been and still is paternalistic. To-day Germany is one of the most official ridden countries in Christendom. Likewise paternalism in the form of a minimum wage in the United States would necessitate a vast army of officials, as my colleague has shown, greatly increasing the power of the central government, interfering in private affairs and forming a prolific source of bribery, graft, and political corruption. When wages are controlled by law, the true ends of government will be lost sight of in the wrangle over fixing wages. Will we submit to this in America? The German people submit to it because paternalism has robbed them of the spirit of independence. The German people are an intelligent, industrious people but paternalism has robbed them of their individuality and personal stamina. Fostered by the government Germans have made wonderful advances along industrial lines, but this material prosperity has been bought at the expense of the political and moral stamina of her people. Honorable Judges, grant for the sake of argument that a minimum wage would materially benefit some people. We dare not weaken the moral fibre of our people for this small benefit. As my colleague has shown and as its friends admit, the minimum wage is designed only for the small minority. Yet for a doubtful benefit to this small minority the affirmative would es-

tablish this paternalistic measure, which is fundamentally wrong, and in the face of the fact that paternalism has always produced the disastrous results that I have pointed out.

In view of these facts taken from history, from Rome to the present time, we must conclude, and I challenge my opponents to disprove, that paternalism on the part of the government will undermine the very existence of liberty. Honorable Judges, my opponents must admit that paternalism is fundamentally a wrong theory of government, that it is destructive of individual enterprise and stamina, that it has always been disastrous in practice. In the last rebuttal speech, however, when I have no chance to reply, my opponents may seek to evade these contentions by one or all of three assertions. Let me answer them now each in turn.

They may say first that the minimum wage is not paternalistic. The minimum wage is paternalistic, because it teaches the people to rely on governmental interference in their behalf rather than upon their own efforts. Any measure which attempts to benefit people directly by fighting their battles for them is paternalistic. The minimum wage is such a measure, hence it is wrong. Any measure which seeks to make the people more efficient, which makes them stronger and better fitted to fight their own battles is not paternalistic. The true function of government is to strengthen people so that they can overcome in life's battles, and not to remove the possibility of struggle without which there can be no strength of character. The only way to lift people to

a higher plain is to help them to help themselves. The history of reform teaches that you must work with people and not for them. By working with people you strengthen them, by working for them you make them weak. The minimum wage seeks to do for people rather than to aid them to help themselves. It would fight their battles for them rather than render them capable of fighting their own battles. Hence it is paternalistic and involves the aforesaid evils.

Now let me answer the second objection. They may say that a minimum wage is only a slight expression of paternalism and will not involve its evils. This is an admission that the minimum wage is a paternalistic measure. The question then arises—will one paternalistic measure involve evil consequences? Honorable Judges, it will. Note the consequences arising from a very similar measure, viz., State Accident Insurance. This measure is distinctly paternalistic and closely resembles the minimum wage. Both are state control of a private and personal matter. Both relate to compensation. Both are designed to protect labor. In the final analysis, they are the same kind of legislation. To prove the evil effects of one paternalistic measure, I quote from "Workmen's Accident Insurance in Germany," by Villard: "We are at the point of destroying all creative effort in Germany. Our German nation—formerly the most industrious in the world—is becoming lazy and easy going. The German plan has worked badly because it is based on the idea of protecting and coddling the workmen, with everything revolving more or less about the question of a

money indemnity. No greater fallacy exists to-day than the apparently widespread notion that German social legislation has had wonderful success and is a pattern for other nations to follow. The Germans themselves are waking up to the fact that their social betterment laws are radically defective and defeating their own objects." The highest German authorities agree that this is the case. "For the careful student and the would-be legislator the most valuable lessons as to how not to proceed can be derived from the history of German social insurance." This proves that any paternalistic measure results in serious evils, and I challenge our opponents to prove that the minimum wage is an exception to the rule.

Now let me answer the third objection. They may say that paternalism in a republic where the people rule would not involve these evils. The evils of paternalism arise from the surrender of personal rights to the sovereign power regardless of the nature of the sovereign power. Paternalism means the extension of the sovereign power. No matter what the sovereign is, the extension of its power curtails the rights of individuals. President Wilson says, "The growth of liberty is the history of the restriction rather than the extension of the powers of government." Therefore paternalism in any form of government encroaches upon liberty. Hence the minimum wage since it is essentially paternalism is fundamentally evil in any form of government.

Thus, Honorable Judges, to conclude this main point, I have proved that a legal minimum wage is based on a

great fundamental evil — paternalism. I have shown furthermore that in no way can the affirmative show that the evils of paternalism will not follow the introduction of a legal minimum wage. Therefore, a legal minimum wage scale should not be put into operation in the United States.

Now let us turn to our sixth main point, "better remedies." The affirmative complain of low wages. My colleague has shown that the majority of workers now earn a comfortable living wage and that the minimum wage would not affect them. For those whose wages are too low, the affirmative propose by the fiat of government to increase the wage. If wages are low there must be a cause. My opponents ignore the cause and strike directly at the result. They seek to raise wages without removing the cause of low wages. This method is unreasonable. You can not successfully correct evil effects and leave the causes unchanged. Hence the legal minimum wage since it deals with results and leaves the causes untouched can not but fail to solve the problem. Honorable Judges, let us seek the causes of low wages and deal with them. These causes are of two kinds, personal and industrial. Chief of the personal causes are drunkenness, inefficiency, and illiteracy. We propose to increase wages by remedying these causes of low wages. We suggest national prohibition, which would not only relieve drunkenness, one of the chief sources of inefficiency, but would also save the laboring classes at least one and one-fourth billion dollars a year, which

is more than a minimum wage could possibly benefit them. We suggest industrial education, and vocational training as a cure for inefficiency and illiteracy.

Now consider the second class of causes for low wages, viz., those due to our industrial and financial systems. Here is where the affirmative lodge their chief objection to our present wage system. They say that the present conditions place labor at the mercy of capital and thus prevent bargaining from working out in accord with the laws of supply and demand. In other words conditions are unnatural and present wages are the result. We agree with this contention that present low wages are the result of unnatural conditions. We propose to change the unnatural conditions. They propose to strike only at the results.

What are these unnatural conditions? Trusts, monopolies, interlocking directorates, and powerful combinations of capital. The abnormal power of these institutions has grown up under the protection of the government. Let the government remove its protection, regulate and control these powerful institutions. Remove the hindrances to the free working of supply and demand and restore the natural relation between labor and capital. Restore the free working of economic law and wages will adjust themselves. These remedies, Honorable Judges, strike at the causes of low wages. A legal minimum wage strikes only at the results and hence utterly fails to solve the difficulty. I leave it to you, Honorable Judges, as to which is the better method.

My opponents may say that the remedies I have pro-

posed, as well as other good measures, such as our school system, compulsory sanitation, pure food laws, etc., are as much paternalistic as a legal minimum wage. This, however, is not true. As I have pointed out there is a fundamental distinction between such measures and the minimum wage. In these measures the government is merely seeking to increase the efficiency and capacity of its citizens, to make them better fitted to win in life's battles. On the other hand the minimum wage does not help the individual to fight life's battles, but fights them for him and leaves him the weaker for being spared the struggle.

Honorable Judges, we have proved that a legal minimum wage should not be put into operation because; (1) conditions do not warrant such a drastic measure; (2) it would not reach the class for which it is designed; (3) it rests on a false premise, both legally and economically; (4) it causes immediate and specific evils; (5) it is based on a fundamentally wrong theory of government; (6) we have pointed out better remedies which do not involve the evils of the minimum wage. In view of these facts we are forced to conclude that a legal minimum wage should not be put into operation.

THE MINIMUM WAGE—II

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA (Negative) vs.
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The following speeches are on the Negative of the minimum wage question as limited to women and children in industry. They won a 3 to 0 decision from the Columbia University Affirmative team at New York City, March 6, 1914. This debate was one of the triangular series on this subject held by Pennsylvania, Columbia and Cornell universities. The Pennsylvania Affirmative lost to the Cornell Negative by a 2 to 1 decision, and the Cornell Affirmative lost to Columbia Negative by a 3 to 0 decision.

The question was stated:

Resolved, that the states should require by law the payment of a minimum wage to women and children employed in industrial and mercantile establishments.

The speeches were contributed in behalf of the debaters by Mr. F. A. Child, Instructor in English in charge of Debating at the University of Pennsylvania.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA vs. COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

FIRST NEGATIVE, K. R. ALDEN, UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The conditions which the previous speaker has painted for you are indeed deplorable. Think of women and children working away their life blood for less than a living wage! We sympathize with these women and we believe that the living wage should be the ultimate American ideal. We want to help these women to better their conditions; we want to help them become stronger and more efficient workers, but a knowledge of economic principles makes us realize that the minimum wage although designed to help this class of women would actually injure them. We are not then debating the question of whether or no women and children should receive a living wage, but the advisability of requiring by law an immediate minimum wage. Because a man is sick is no reason why he should go to a quack doctor to be cured just because the doctor says that he will cure him. The true doctor realizes that the best he can do is to let nature run its own course. So it must be in remedying

Index

First, I will endeavor to show you that it is impracticable because it is paternalistic in its operation. The second speaker will show you that it is a superficial remedy in that it does not strike at the causes for low wages, and finally, the last speaker will show that it would be injurious.

First, then, the minimum wage is harmful because it would introduce worse evils than those it seeks to cure. John Stuart Mill says that no wage reform can hope to prove efficacious which does not operate through the minds and habits of the people. That is what this minimum wage law fails to do; it fails to operate through the minds and habits of the people.

The gentlemen of the affirmative see the evil of low wages, so they say let's pass a law forbidding any women to work for less than the minimum. If social reforms were accomplished so easily we would have reached the millennium long ago. Our worthy opponents forget that although they can forbid employment at less than the minimum they cannot guarantee employment at the minimum. Such a law does not change the efficiency of the worker, nor the disposition of the employer. He is still in industry to make money, and if the law requires him to pay women \$8.00 who are not worth that amount to him they will simply lose their employment.

But let us turn for a moment to the pages of history for a few cases where the government endeavored to stop an abuse by the mere fiat of the law without removing the causes for the abuse.

In Bavaria the government passed a law intended to

prevent improvident marriages. It prevented marriages indeed, but it introduced a far worse condition, so that to-day in Munich, the capital of Bavaria, more than half the births are illegitimate. No doubt a minimum wage would do away with employment under the minimum, but we are afraid that, like the marriage law, it might do away with employment too.

Another case in point is that of the Spitalfield weavers in England. In 1773 they obtained an act providing a minimum wage. The desired end of increased pay seemed reasonable enough, but the workers did not realize the consequences of being forbidden to work at reduced rates. When they sought the law they little thought that four thousand looms would be brought to a standstill in consequence of trade going elsewhere! Here again the government brought about a worse evil, the evil of non-employment for low wages which it sought to correct. Because it attempted an arbitrary rise in wage without increasing the productivity of the workers.

We have mentioned the improvement of the conditions of woman labor through channels of present day growth. And we wish to point out that the conditions of women in industry seem daily improving, as a consequence of twentieth century enlightenment. And we ask the question: Why should we frustrate natural development by artificial law? To-day we have employers all over the country carrying on industrial welfare work for their employees. The Wanamaker stores are a good example of this kind of work. Such employers realize that it is to their advantage to have as efficient employees as possible.

They find that the goodwill of the employees means added energy in their work. With an idea of promoting efficiency and good will they provide sick pensions, classes for instruction, lunch rooms, clubs, etc., all tending toward this end.

In U. S. L. B. 123 which is a study of employers welfare work, we read that wages increased as efficiency increased. Efficiency first and then a higher wage. If instead of this voluntary action on the part of the employer, the government should endeavor to guarantee a minimum wage instead of this feeling of loyalty toward the employer with increased efficiency, there would be a spirit of antagonism and consequent lessened efficiency.

In closing let me remind you that the negative is most anxious to help these low paid women, but we believe that the only sane way to do this is along the lines of natural evolution which we see so clearly manifested around us. I have shown you that the minimum wage is harmful because it would introduce worse evils than the one it seeks to remedy; the next speaker for the negative will show you that it is a superficial remedy; and the last speaker will demonstrate that it is injurious to the women themselves.

SECOND NEGATIVE, G. P. WILLIAMS, JR., UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has shown that we, too, are sympathetic with these women and children workers. We would that all were receiving a living wage, and are not

here to dispute that proposition, but the method by which that wage is to be attained. We object to the minimum wage because, as the first speaker has shown, it is impracticable, as it is too direct a method. I shall show that it is superficial at best, and the last speaker will show that it is injurious to the workers themselves.

It is superficial, for it does not remove the causes which are producing low wages in this country, and even if you pass a minimum wage law those causes will still exist and tend to pull wages down to as low a minimum as possible. The causes are, primarily: First, an over supply of labor, due primarily to immigration. In New York City in December, 1913, there were five applicants for positions for every one offered. Second, the workers lack productive ability. Let us consider these causes of low wages and see that they are not removed but even made more acute by the minimum wage. Let us consider immigration as a source of over-supply — and hence, low wage. The 1910 statistical abstract, chart 143, shows that there are 4,000,000 white working women in the United States, and that 2,000,000 of them are foreign. The Report of the Commissioner of Immigration for 1911 states that the flooding of the country with cheap foreign labor tends to reduce the American standards of living. Immigration keeps the wage down, for as fast as one race comes to this country — and through better environment, etc., is able to demand better conditions — so soon is that race removed from that industry, and a new race, fresh from Europe with the old standards and the old ideas, takes its

place just as the Irish have been replaced by the Italians as ditch diggers since the latter came to us with the low standards of Europe which require but a low wage to maintain. The United Garment Workers of America recognized this fact when in 1905 they petitioned Congress to restrict immigration and thereby guard against the encroachments being made upon American ideals. In our own far west the exclusion of Chinese laborers and the restriction upon Japanese immigration have been tried with an eye to the wage scale, and, since the wages have risen as a result, the negative advocates the further restriction of immigration, thereby lowering the number of workers and thereby helping wages to rise of themselves. This is our solution of this phase of the problem. The affirmative disregards this cause of low wage but would by offering a large guaranteed wage offer an inducement to more and more immigrants to come to our shores, which could only result in greater congestion and over-crowding and would furnish more and more money to be sent out of the country to the old folks at home.

The second cause of low wage is lack of productive ability. This is due to lack of education and of home ideals and a proper knowledge of food values. The girls leave home at an early age, sixteen or seventeen, or thereabouts, avowedly with the intent of staying in industry only until they shall have opportunity to become married. Because of this intent they are unwilling to remain long in school, fitting themselves for industrial usefulness, and yet the affirmative would require the employer to pay for an efficiency which is not there and which cannot be

there, since the girl has declined to receive the training. For those with defective education we propose a gradual improvement by night schools and store schools such as the Wanamaker store of Philadelphia maintains. For those with faulty home ideals and ignorance of food values we propose social work—publicity—visiting nurses, etc., all supported by the state, so that eventually you will have the cause of low wage—unproductiveness—removed because the workers will be trained in mind and efficient in body due to their improved conditions in school and home. This would take time, we admit, but no true reform went through to a satisfactory result over night. The minimum wage disregards the fact that the average worker is unproductive to a degree, but says "give them a better wage and efficiency will come later, maybe, perhaps—we hope so," thus completely reversing every common-sense principle which says, "efficiency first and good wages afterward." The business world demands efficiency first.

A friend of mine in Philadelphia has three stenographers, one of whom is very efficient and enters no further into the discussion. The other two, although both were graduates of a business college, were careless in their work and were often corrected. One took a large part of her course over again and inside of a month the quality of her work increased greatly, and she was raised \$10 a month in salary. The other paid little or no attention to the corrections and was to have been discharged on January 1 last. A simple but true illustra-

tion of the fact that the business world demands efficiency first and will pay for it when it comes.

Now, Honorable Judges, I have shown that we are sympathetic with the workers, but that the minimum wage is the wrong method of obtaining relief. This, we would accomplish by removing the causes which are keeping wages down at present. The minimum wage is wrong, as it is impracticable. It is superficial as I have shown, for it disregards the fundamental causes of low wages, and I have shown that those causes, over-supply and unproductiveness, would continue even more acute after the passage of a minimum wage law.

The third speaker on the negative will show it to be injurious to the workers themselves, and if we can show it to be impracticable and superficial and injurious to the workers themselves we ask what is its justification?

THIRD NEGATIVE, E. L. HARGETT, UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA, '14

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker for the negative has shown you that the proposed law would be impracticable; the second speaker has shown you that it would be superficial; I will endeavor to show you that it is unnecessary and would result injuriously.

Let me again impress upon you that we of the negative realize that the wages of some women are deplorably low; we realize that every woman should receive a living-wage; we sympathize fully with women workers and are

anxious to improve their conditions and their wages; but it is because we believe that a minimum wage law will not bring about this improvement that we are opposed to it. Indeed, it is because of our sympathy for the low paid women dependent upon their labor that we offer our greatest opposition to this law; for it is clear that such a law can only react injuriously upon the very women whom it is designed to benefit, and will aggravate their already deplorable circumstances. The advocates of a minimum wage law base their contention upon the erroneous assumption that every employable woman would be able to obtain employment at the minimum wage, and if this were true no objection could be offered to the law. But in reality the enforcement of a minimum wage law would throw thousands of employable women out of work, and would prevent the many already unemployed from obtaining work.

Let me illustrate my point. I presume that you all understand what is meant by the economic law of diminishing returns. It is, stated briefly, that after a certain point is reached in production, an increase of expenditure will not result in a corresponding increase of product. We shall assume that a manufacturer has a given equipment which will be most productive with one hundred workers. He can afford to pay each of those one hundred workers \$8 per week. Now with the same equipment he can employ one hundred additional workers; but because of the operation of the law of diminishing returns, the product of the second hundred workers

will not be as large as the product of the first hundred. Hence the manufacturer can afford to pay each of the second hundred only \$6 per week; and if a minimum wage law of \$8 per week were passed, it would mean that the second hundred workers would lose their jobs. The fact that the manufacturer employs these second hundred workers at \$6 per week, does not mean that he is a tyrant exploiting the women. It simply means that \$6 per week is all the second hundred are worth to him. He is, in fact, doing them a kindness by employing them at all. Little as \$6 a week is, it means a lot to those women. It is, to them, the difference between independent existence on the one hand and charity, vice or starvation on the other. Yet the gentlemen of the affirmative, by enacting a minimum wage law, would deprive all such women of what little income they now enjoy; and still they claim to be espousing the cause of women. I presume they must be endeavoring to promulgate the teaching of the Bible when it says, "From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." It is because we of the negative sympathize with these women and do not wish to see their already deplorable condition aggravated, that we oppose a minimum wage law.

There are at present thousands of idle women in our cities who cannot get employment at any wage. We read that in San Francisco and other cities the unemployed have organized and have called upon the officials for help. At a mass meeting of unemployed held in this city (New York) on January 28, under the auspices of the Women's Trade Union League, the following resolution was

adopted: "Whereas thousands of working women and young girls who are dependent upon themselves for support, are idle; we, the unemployed women and girls, in mass meeting assembled, do hereby call upon the city and state authorities to provide us with work. We emphatically protest against our enforced idleness." If these idle women could obtain employment at \$6 per week, would there be any justice in a law which would prevent them from accepting it? Would there be any justice in a minimum wage law which virtually says that because women cannot get work at \$8 per week they shall remain idle? Yet that is the sort of legislation which the affirmative are advocating.

This law would also be injurious because inexpedient and unnecessary. The problem of low wages is speedily solving itself along natural lines, and it is hazardous for us to attempt to compel the issue by the immediate enforcement of an arbitrary, premature minimum wage. Chart 161 of the Statistical Abstract of United States shows that between 1900 and 1907 wages have increased considerably faster than the cost of living. Conscientious, progressive employers everywhere are beginning to realize that it is profitable for them to pay women what they earn. Accordingly, the National Biscuit Co., Heinze, John Wanamaker, Sears and Roebuck and innumerable other employers have made exhaustive studies of the earning capacity of their employees, and are now voluntarily paying them what they earn. The few unprogressive employers who still cling to the old methods and attempt to exploit women by paying them less than

they earn cannot long compete with their more progressive rivals, and will speedily be eliminated from the industrial field. It is foolish to attempt to bring about this natural evolution over night by the immediate enforcement of an arbitrary, premature minimum wage, with no regard for earning capacity. For example, what would have been the injurious result if the law had attempted to compel Mr. Ford, five years ago to pay his employees \$5 a day? We cannot compel a rose to bloom prematurely; we can only create conditions favorable to its growth. Likewise, we cannot compel high wages by direct legislation; we can only create conditions favorable to high wages; and a premature, artificial minimum wage law will only interrupt the natural evolution now taking place.

In the great majority of cases, if the wages paid are low, it is because the earning capacity of the workers is also low, and they cannot earn more than they receive. A recent investigation by the Russell Sage Foundation revealed that in five representative industries approximately forty per cent. of the women workers were between sixteen and twenty-four years of age. In Philadelphia an investigation by the Consumers' League revealed that the trade life of the average telephone operator is of only two and one-half years duration. These figures are significant in showing that a great many women in industry are casual workers who seek employment only as a makeshift until marriage. They do not remain in industry long enough to become efficient. Naturally, the productiveness of such unskilled, casual workers is low, and their corresponding wage cannot be otherwise than

low. But since a minimum wage law does not increase their productiveness, it would simply mean that all such women would lose their employment and income, small as it is. Yet the gentlemen of the affirmative tell you they are advocating this law in the interests of these women. I don't understand how this may be, unless the loss of all employment relieves such women from the necessity of living.

If a minimum wage law is advocated on the ground that it would be a substitute for women's labor unions, it is unnecessary and injurious. Unnecessary because women workers everywhere are speedily awakening to the advantages of organization and collective bargaining. Every day we read in the papers that some body of women workers have completed a successful strike. I hold in my hand now a clipping announcing that 3000 female textile workers in Philadelphia have just succeeded in a strike for higher wages, and that is typical of the present. There is no reason why women cannot organize just as effectively as men. If, in exceptional cases, unscrupulous employers are seeking to exploit the women, we should do everything to encourage and assist them to organize, so that they may compel the employer to pay them what they earn regardless of the minimum. A minimum wage law at best would not benefit those earning more than the minimum. Such a law would be injurious because it would check this desirable tendency toward organization. Women workers should be just as self-reliant and independent as men workers. Reliance and dependence upon a paternalistic

government is degenerating. Let the state give the women every facility to organize, so that they themselves may compel the employer to pay them what they earn, whereby those earning more than the minimum will be given equal justice with those earning less. A minimum wage law would prevent this desirable organization by making the women dependent upon the paternalism rather than upon themselves; and the substitution of state paternalism for independent initiative and organization can only be degenerating and injurious to the women whom it affects.

I have shown you that a minimum wage law would aggravate the already pitiable condition of the very women for whom it is intended. I have shown you that it is unnecessary and injurious as a substitute for organization. Upon what ground, then, do the gentlemen of the affirmative advocate this law as benefiting the women?

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, K. R. ALDEN, UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is exceedingly interesting to-night to realize that the gentlemen of the affirmative maintain that they are not building up an abstract case, that they are not advocating a theoretical reform which has never yet been tried, in short, that they base their case solely on the examination of facts which they have gathered from states or countries where the minimum wage is an established institution. I say that this is exceedingly interest-

ing because that is just what we of the negative wish to do, and, Honorable Judges, we ask you to make your decision on this basis.

The gentlemen of Columbia have told you that the minimum wage is in operation in nine of our states, that Australia, New Zealand and England have installed it and that it has proved everywhere an unqualified success. Let us see.

Taking our own country first. The gentlemen of the opposition seem to have mistaken the passage of the law, with its operation. According to the secretaries of labor of the various states where the minimum wage has been passed, only four states have actually put the minimum wage into operation. These states are Massachusetts, Oregon, Utah, and Nebraska. Of these states only one (Utah) has a full provision for enforcement by law, and two of the other states (Massachusetts and Nebraska) realize that it would be disastrous to enforce the findings of the commission by law, they therefore provide merely for the publication of the names of such employers as do not conform with the standard of wage that they determine. Thus they make of the law only an educational proposition, and this is the only way that wages can be permanently bettered. This, Honorable Judges, is the glorious state of the minimum wage in the United States!

But let us turn to Australia, that garden of proofs for the theorist. The gentlemen of the negative have been very kind in telling us what Mr. Aves, the English specialist on this subject, says, but listen with me to his own words. I quote from U. S. Labor Bul. No. 80, page 45.

"The difficulty of enforcing a legal minimum wage would be much greater in the mother country than in the colonies, because of the great population and the vast urban districts, containing workers of every degree of aptitude and capacity, and of every industrial age, all of them subjected to unprotected competition from foreign workers. The practical impossibility of preventing collusion between masters and men to evade the established wage — an embarrassment even in Victoria — the whole problem of incompetent hands and juvenile workers and learners, the territorial differences . . . affecting competitions between districts, were all cited as difficulties against the law." This is what Mr. Aves says. This is what they call unqualified success! Mr. Aves frankly admits that they can't take care of the incompetent and that is the very person that the law is designed to benefit. It would take away the little opportunity that an inefficient girl has of keeping her head above the water. I say with Professor John Bates Clark of your University, "If five dollars a week forces a woman into vice, no dollars per week would do it more surely and quickly." (*Atlantic Monthly*, 1913, p. 294.)

The problem resolves itself down to this. We assert that the legal enforcement of a living minimum wage would harm the very persons it was designed to benefit, because they could not get employment at so high a rate. Let us turn again to the facts in Australia, for, Honorable Judges, you are to decide the case upon them, and see first what the minimum wage there is, and then how it affected employment.

I quote now from the act entitled, "Minimum Wage Act, 1908, New South Wales." Section 4. "No workman or shop assistant shall be employed unless in receipt of a weekly wage of at least four shillings (\$.97) irrespective of any amount earned as overtime." Think of it, Honorable Judges, a weekly wage of ninety-seven cents. We of the negative would hardly object to such a minimum wage. But review with me the suffering even so mild a law has wrought in Australia. I quote from a study made by the United States published as Labor Bulletin No. 56. We read page 123, concerning New South Wales, "Therefore, as in Victoria, slow workers are thrown out of employment . . . even though the court has made some arrangement by which they may be employed at a rate somewhat lower than the minimum wage." And this, Honorable Judges, with a minimum wage of 97 cents a week. But that is not all. On page 180 of the same report we read that in "the following year 139,771, or more than ten per cent. of the people of the state received aid from government institutions." This was only eight years after the passage of Australia's first minimum wage law. From the considerations of the effects of a very small minimum wage law in Australia we can get some idea of the distress that the passage of the radical, far-reaching proposition of our opponents would cause.

Honorable Judges, the facts are before you. Judge upon that basis.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, G. P. WILLIAMS, UNIVERSITY
OF PENNSYLVANIA, '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The affirmative is wrong in demanding a minimum wage for children, or any one under 21 years of age, for until the worker is 21 his or her parents are legally responsible for his or her support, and the responsibility can be enforced by law. If the worker is an orphan, or of improvident parents, it is the duty of the state not the employer to see to it that he receives a living. Hence, it is not correct for the affirmative to be burdening the employer with an obligation which, in the case of child workers, belongs properly to the state and not to the employer. My worthy opponents' only answer to the proposed further restriction of immigration is to raise the question as to what we would do with the female foreign workers who are here now. This is no answer at all. What would he have us do with them? They will stay at their positions as before, of course, we have no desire to molest them, and any cases of dire need, such as the gentlemen describe can be handled by charity workers, mothers' pensions, etc., and it is our purpose only to guard against further pressure from abroad, which at present is acting as a source of over-supply and hence a cause of low wages. We insist that we have met this phase of the problem while the affirmative has only added inducements to more and more immigrants and have thereby started to produce greater congestion and over-supply.

The gentlemen have asserted that more money will bring more efficiency. This does not necessarily follow. The Bulletin of the Labor Bureau, p. 80, says that the foreign workers here lack ideas of food values and cited cases of German and even English parents feeding infants on beer and pickles. More money would do these people no good. They would only buy more beer and more pickles. Rather, let us teach them that the nickel which buys the beer will buy a quart of milk and that the milk is better for the baby, so that efficiency can come eventually upon the adopting of saner views on diet.

The affirmative says that minimum wage will protect the foreigner from exploitation. This cannot be so, for the minimum wage does not guarantee the women employment, and many of the more ignorant women couldn't earn the wage anyway, so it would be to the advantage of the workers to evade the law rather than be thrown out of work, or else go into sweating.

The gentlemen read a letter from the Oregon Commissioner which boasts of the success of the minimum wage in that state. We, too, happen to have a letter from the Secretary of that Commissioner which says the opposite (I hold the letter up) and we believe our letter is as good authority as the one they read.

I then closed my rebuttal with a short summary of my main speech, and added that the speech had not been attacked as being incorrect, but that the affirmative had merely said my solution of the wage question by remov-

ing the causes of low wage would take time. I admitted this but wound up by declaring vehemently that a slow but correct solution of any problem was preferable to a hasty, incorrect leap in the dark, which could never be satisfactory.

[NOTE: This main speech and rebuttal, written up three months after the debate, very largely from memory, cannot be as complete or satisfactory as it was when delivered. I hope this fact is considered.—G. P. W.]

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, E. L. HARGETT, UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA, '14

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have appealed to your sentiments on behalf of the women and children; but if sentimentality is to be made the issue of this question, the negative surely deserves most of the tears. If a woman is unable to live comfortably on \$6 per week, and to provide herself with the necessities of life, her condition will be infinitely worse if she is prohibited from working at all; and that is what a minimum wage law would do in effect. If all of the heartrending conditions which the gentlemen of the affirmative have described exist because the women receive low wages, how much worse those conditions will inevitably be if the women receive no wages at all! And the gentlemen of the affirmative have failed to show that a minimum wage law would not throw thousands of women out of employment. We admit what the affirmative has spent many minutes trying to prove, namely, that the condition of many women workers is deplorable.

But we do not believe, and the affirmative has failed absolutely to prove, that a minimum wage law is the proper remedy for correcting the evil. It will indeed, as we have shown, aggravate the bad conditions. However, we believe that reason, not sentiment, should decide this question, and in the realm of reason the gentlemen of the affirmative have been woefully lacking.

They have mentioned a machine, and have said that because every machine is worth the cost of its maintenance, every woman should be worth the cost of hers, and, therefore, we should have a minimum wage law. We admit that every machine is worth the cost of its own maintenance; and we admit that every woman is worth the cost of her own maintenance, but we don't see what connection that has with a minimum wage law. Because every machine is worth the cost of its own maintenance, does it follow that there is any absolute amount which may be fixed as the minimum sum necessary for the maintenance of every machine? Likewise, because every woman is worth the cost of her own maintenance, does it follow that there is any absolute amount which may be fixed as the minimum necessary for the maintenance of every woman? Decidedly not. The amount necessary for the maintenance of a machine must be determined largely by the productiveness of that individual machine; and the amount necessary for the maintenance of a woman must be determined largely by the productiveness of that individual woman. In neither case is it possible to fix a definite arbitrary minimum for all machines and for all women.

But let us carry the analogy a step further. Suppose some benevolent wiseacre should determine that the minimum of maintenance for every machine should be \$100 a year, and should procure legislation to that effect. Would it benefit the machine whose maintenance is worth more than \$100 per year? Most assuredly not; for every owner realizes that it is profitable for him to spend for maintenance, whatever the machine is worth, and will do so voluntarily without legislative pressure. Will such a law benefit those machines whose maintenance is not worth \$100 per year? Again, most assuredly not; because no sane manufacturer would spend more on a machine than it is worth; he would simply throw it on the junk pile. And the same reasoning applies to a minimum wage law. As I have shown you, if the woman is worth the minimum, the employer will pay it voluntarily. If she is not worth the minimum, he will simply discharge her, and she will lose what little income she previously enjoyed.

But, the affirmative tell you, the manufacturer owns the machine, and it costs him money to get a new one whereas he does not own the women, and he can get new ones for nothing. But that fact is all the more reason why such a law would be more injurious to the women than the machines. Since a machine costs money to get, it might be more profitable to pay the minimum than discard the machine, and the owner has the assurance that he will benefit from any increased efficiency due to a greater expenditure for maintenance. Hence in the case of the machine the owner might pay the minimum

when the machine was not actually worth it. But since a woman does not cost the employer anything to get, it will always be more profitable to discharge her if she is not worth the minimum, than to pay it. Furthermore, since he does not own the woman, in case he should keep her and pay the minimum, he has no assurance that he will benefit from the increased efficiency of the woman. Just about the time she is able to earn the minimum, she might get married or hire herself to a competitor. So you may be sure that in case a woman could not earn the legal minimum she would be discharged immediately, and the dry crust and half filled cup would be knocked from her hand. Yet the gentlemen of the affirmative have advocated this law in behalf of such low paid women.

The affirmative have admitted the efficacy of organization in enabling men to demand what they earn; but they say women are physically unable to organize and strike successfully. Vanity of vanities! Don't our opponents read the papers? Do the militant suffragettes of England evince any of the so-called defenceless weakness of womanhood?

We have shown you that this law is impracticable, superficial and injurious. We have shown that it has not been a success in Australia, the only country where it has been given a thorough trial. We have shown that the law has no justification in sentiment or reason; and in the three minutes yet remaining to the affirmative, I ask them to answer these questions or admit defeat.

1. Can every employable woman earn the minimum?

2. Will employers pay the women more than they earn?

3. If, as you say, a woman's condition is pitiful with low wages, how will it be improved with no wages?

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Aves, Ernest. Report to the English Government on the *Minimum Wage in Australia*.

Nearing and Watson. *Economics*.

Minimum Wage Statutes of Massachusetts, Utah, Colorado, California, Wisconsin, Oregon, Minnesota, Washington, Nebraska, U. S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1911.

Wright, Carroll D. *Practical Sociology*.

Various encyclopedias on "Wages."

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

Century M. 84:311-13. Je. '12. *Perils of the Minimum Wage*.

Labor Bulletin No. 56. Ja. '05. *Labor Conditions in Australia*.

Labor Bulletin No. 80. Ja. '09. *Women and Child Wage-earners in Great Britain*.

Literary Digest. 46:774-5. Apr. 5, '13. *Minimum Wage from a New Angle*.

Nineteenth Century. 73:664-58. *Principle of the Minimum Wage*.

THE SINGLE TAX

THE SINGLE TAX

*EUREKA COLLEGE vs. ILLINOIS WESLEYAN
and JAMES MILLIKEN UNIVERSITIES*

On March 19, 1915, the debates in the Eureka-Illinois Wesleyan-Milliken triangular league were held and resulted in a victory for Eureka College, whose teams won on both sides of the question. The affirmative team won unanimously over the Milliken negative at Eureka, and the negative team won by a two to one decision from Illinois Wesleyan at Bloomington, Ill. The single tax question has never been widely popular as a debate subject, but it has been used every year by some college and by many high schools and seems to be growing more popular each year.

As debated by Eureka College the question was stated,
Resolved, that the State of Illinois should adopt a system of single tax based on rental values.

The Eureka speeches were collected and submitted to intercollegiate debates by President H. O. Pritchard of Eureka College. President Pritchard takes great interest in college debating and has supervised sixteen debates in the last eight years. His teams won in all but three of these contests.

OUTLINE OF AFFIRMATIVE SIDE

Introduction.

I. Statement of Question.

1. The issues involved in the debate.
2. Definition of terms.
3. Statement of the affirmative's case.

Discussion.

I. The Single Tax is sound.

1. It does not restrain industry.
 - A. A tax upon a product tends to lessen the demand for it.
 - B. The proposed tax exempts the products of industry and therefore encourages them.
2. It is a tax upon wealth from which society receives no other benefit.
 - A. Land is not created by the investment of wealth.
 - B. That portion of capital which represents a monopoly on land is non-productive.
3. It is a tax upon values created by society.
 - A. Rental values are a social product.
 - B. Society has a right to take the values which it creates.

II. The Single Tax is just.

1. It avoids double taxation.
 - A. Many forms of double taxation under the present system.
 - B. The single tax is based upon one form of property, the location of which is fixed.
2. It discourages land monopoly.
 - A. Land monopoly is increasing rapidly.
 - B. It will discourage this by making it unprofitable.
3. It promotes social welfare.
 - A. By reducing tenantry.
 - B. By encouraging industry.

III. It is practicable.

1. It remedies the defects of the present system.
 - A. The present system is cumbersome and expensive.
 - B. The present system encourages dishonesty.

2. The single tax would be adequate without being burdensome.
 - A. Report of the State Board of Equalization.
 - B. It would take only one and one-third per cent. of rental value.
3. It has been tried.
 - A. Foreign countries have found it successful.
 - B. The experiences in America are equally satisfactory.

Conclusion.

Recapitulation of arguments.

OUTLINE OF NEGATIVE SIDE

Introduction.

- I. Statement of Question.
 1. Definition of terms.
 2. The burden of proof for the affirmative.
 3. Statement of the negative's position.

Discussion.

- I. The single tax is false in theory.
 1. It violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely:
 - A. Each individual should support the government in proportion to his ability to pay.
 - B. The single tax is based upon rental values and may exempt those most able to pay.
 2. It violates the fundamental principle of justice.
 - A. It discriminates against one element of production.
 - B. It discriminates against a single class of society.
- II. The single tax is based upon a false economy.
 1. A tax upon rental values of land would be inadequate.
 - A. Many sections of the state too poor to bear such a tax.
 - B. Such a tax would fail to meet increased needs and be inelastic.
 2. If made adequate it would become confiscatory.
 - A. To take the necessary rental value would force down the selling price.

- B. Economists claim that it is confiscatory and experience has proved the truth of their statements.

III. The single tax rests upon a failure in practice.

- 1. It is impossible to find the rental value of land.
 - A. Capital, labor and social demands create values. These cannot be separated from the value of the bare land.
 - B. Land has little value apart from improvements. A tax on these is a tax on industry.
- 2. It has failed to work where tried.
 - A. In Canada it has had disastrous results.
 - B. Where tried in the United States, even in a modified form it has proved unsuccessful.

Conclusion.

- I. Proposed remedy — the report of special tax commission.
 - 1. This would remedy defects.
 - 2. It could be adopted without a disturbance of our industrial system, and is far preferable to the single tax.

II. Summary of arguments for the negative.

THE SINGLE TAX

*EUREKA COLLEGE vs. JAMES MILLIKEN
UNIVERSITY*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, ELMER KELSO HIGDON, EUREKA
COLLEGE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opponents, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question for debate to-night is: "Resolved, that the State of Illinois should adopt a system of single tax based on rental value." This debate grows out of the fact that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the present system of taxation because of the many evils growing out of it. Aside from the present system of taxation the only other system that has ever been seriously considered or adopted is the single tax. Therefore, the issue in this debate is, which of these two systems shall we have? The negative in this debate is committed to the defense of the present system, since there is no other, aside from the single tax, and must prove that it is sound in principle, and is or can be made just in application and will therefore remedy the present evils — evils which have arisen under this same general property tax. It is not sufficient for them simply to decry the single tax for unless they can show that the present system is superior to it, they have failed to estab-

lish their case. We of the affirmative are committed to the adoption of the single tax and shall prove that it ought to be adopted instead of our present general property tax.

However, before proceeding with the argument, it is important to have clearly in mind what is meant by the terms of this question. By single tax is meant that the revenue derived from the present general property tax shall be secured by a tax upon the annual rental value of land. By land is meant not only farm land but also mineral deposits, forests, water fronts, water resources, building sites, land valuable for special purposes, in fact all land that is in any way useful to society. By rental value is meant the annual value of the use or control of a given area of land, exclusive of individual tangible improvements. Let it also be remembered throughout this debate that land enjoys certain distinctions accorded to no other form of wealth. First: Land is a natural resource, whereas other goods are produced by human effort. Second: The supply of land is limited and cannot be materially increased. Third: Land does not go out of existence, whereas other goods must be continually replaced. Fourth: Land is the only common form of wealth that can rise in value, through any long period of time, above the cost of production. These distinctions we shall demonstrate as the argument proceeds.

We of the affirmative maintain that the single tax should be adopted for three all-important reasons: First, it is sound. Second, it is just. Third, it is practicable. I shall maintain that it is sound; my first col-

league will show that it is just; and, the third speaker on the affirmative will prove that it is practicable.

The single tax is sound in principle, because it does not restrict industry. A tax upon a product tends to lessen the demand for and the supply of that product. For instance, if a tax of twenty-five cents per volume were placed upon books, a large number of persons who are now purchasers of books either could not or would not pay the additional price. That is, a large number of marginal buyers would be eliminated. This decreased demand would necessitate either a curtailment of manufacturing among all publishers, or the withdrawal of certain companies from the publishing business. In either case the opportunities for labor and the number of people who enjoy the use of books would be diminished. Taxes on capital invested in tools of production, or upon any kind of manufacturing plant, will have the same effect; because the increased cost of production increases the price of the goods and decreases the number of buyers. It follows then that less capital will be invested in the tools of production. Under the present system this is precisely what we are doing. We tax the tools of industry and make a man pay for his thrift. If a man buys tools with which to work his farm, we tax him for so doing. If a man builds a house in which to live we tax him for his enterprise. If he improves a downtown lot so as to make all other property about him more valuable we make him pay a tax for his folly.

A single tax based upon the rental value of land, how-

ever, is not restrictive, because it is not a tax upon tools of production, nor on the product of industry. For as has already been stated, land is a natural resource and does not exist as the result of invested capital and labor, all other forms of wealth are the result of capital and labor and would not exist if these were not invested in them. For instance, the canning factory in this city is here because \$25,000 of capital was invested in it. It furnishes opportunities for labor that would not be given if this investment had not been made; it supplies society with a product that it could not otherwise obtain. Any tax which discourages such investment of capital decreases the opportunities for labor and deprives society of a valuable product; and is, therefore, a detriment. The proposed system, by freeing such investments from taxation, encourages industry and is, therefore, an economic benefit.

The single tax is sound in principle because it is a tax upon wealth from which society receives no other benefit. We have already seen how money invested in a manufacturing plant benefits society. On the other hand, take \$25,000 invested in the canning factory and invest the same in a tract of land. What favorable results accrue to society? Does the capital bring the land into existence as it did the factory? Does the mere purchase of the land create an additional opportunity for labor? Does simply holding the title increase the productivity of the land? If the purchaser makes no further investment none of these things result. It is only as he adds build-

ings, implements, livestock — the tools of production — that they follow.

It is necessary at this point to make a clear distinction between the landlord and the farmer as a farmer. As a landlord, he owns the land, as a farmer he owns the tools of production and cultivates or uses the land. The landlord invests his capital in land. The farmer invests his capital in the means of production. This is the more easily seen when the capital is controlled by separate individuals and we have the relationship of landlord and tenant. But it is equally true when one man makes both investments. That portion of his capital which represents a monopoly upon land is non-productive. That portion which is invested in buildings, live-stock, implements, etc., is productive. Honorable Judges, under the present general property tax the productive capital bears a greater burden of tax than the non-productive capital, because it is the custom of assessors to list improvements (the productive portion of the capital) at one-third of their estimated value, while they assess land at one-third of one-half of its estimated value. Under the proposed system, only land values, the capital which is non-productive to society are taxed. Therefore, because it taxes the only capital that is making no other returns to society, we maintain that the single tax is sound in principle.

The single tax is sound in principle because it is a tax based upon the values created by society. Rental value is a social product. It is increased for any particular piece of land by the improvements that are placed upon

the neighboring land, and by the mere occupancy of such neighboring land. Every city in the state bears evidence of this fact. A quarter acre of yellow clay in the heart of Chicago is worth more than a whole section of the best black loam in Central Illinois. A lot in Chicago, bought in 1830 for \$20 is to-day worth \$2,000,000. This enormous increase in value is not due to the expenditure of money or energy on the part of the owner. It is the result of two conditions: the increased population and the limited supply of land.

As we pointed out in the beginning land is the only commodity which steadily grows in value to an unlimited extent. The constantly increasing demand might raise the value of other commodities and thus create an unearned increment were it not for the fact that the supply can be correspondingly increased. The price of any other property cannot far exceed the cost of production, for as soon as it has thus advanced capital will produce it in larger quantities, and the greater supply will again lower prices. For instance, contrast houses with land, as an example of general property. As the population of a city increases, the demand for houses also increases, and if no new ones were built, rent would be raised to an exorbitant rate; but as soon as the rent is much in excess of the fair rate of interest upon the capital invested, new houses are constructed and rent is kept at a reasonable price. On the other hand, as the population in this same city increases the demand for land must also increase, and since, unlike houses, new land cannot be constructed, its rental value constantly increases and there accrues an

enormous and peculiar unearned increment. We must remember that in addition to the unearned increment land is free from a maintenance cost which with other classes of property amounts to two per cent. annually. Therefore, the single tax is sound in principle because it is the only system of taxation which recognizes these fundamental differences between land and other property, and adequately reaches the unearned increment.

Honorable Judges, I have proved that the single tax does not restrict industry; that it is a tax upon a class of wealth which returns no other benefits to society, and that it reaches the unearned increment, and is, therefore, sound in principle. For these reasons the single tax ought to be adopted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, ERNEST EUGENE HIGDON, EUREKA COLLEGE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opponents, Ladies and Gentlemen: My first colleague has proved that the single tax is sound in principle. First, because it does not restrict industry; second, because it is a tax upon capital which returns no other benefits to society, and third, because it reaches the unearned increment.

I shall prove that the single tax system is just. It is just, first, because it avoids double taxation. This double taxation, as practiced under the present system, takes many forms, of which we give a few examples: First, the general property tax, together with the income tax, may force a man to pay a tax not only upon his property but upon the income which is derived from that prop-

erty. Or, he may pay a tax upon his property, and, at the same time, a license for the privilege of conducting his business. Second, the man must pay a tax upon the property in his possession even though he has given notes or mortgages for part or all of the value of such property. And the man who holds the notes or mortgages is taxed upon the same value. For example, if a horse is sold for two hundred dollars, fifty dollars in cash and a note for a hundred and fifty being given, the purchaser is taxed upon two hundred dollars and the seller is taxed on the hundred and fifty-dollar note, resulting in an assessment upon three hundred and fifty dollars. Third, a corporation may be taxed upon its entire corporate value, and also upon the property owned, the value of which is included in the corporate value. That is, a manufacturing company, capitalized at \$400,000, having \$200,000 worth of property included in the capitalization, is taxed not only upon the \$400,000 capitalized value, but also upon the \$200,000 worth of property, thus, the \$200,000 is doubly taxed. Fourth, property in another state owned by a resident of Illinois, may be taxed there and the stocks representing it may be taxed here.

In face of these and other facts it is no wonder that Professor Seligman exclaims, "The possible entanglements are well-nigh innumerable." Honorable Judges, it is evident that the proposed system will remedy these injustices growing out of the present general property tax because it bases taxation upon one form of property, the location of which is fixed. We demand that our worthy opponents propose a better remedy for each of these four

phases of double taxation, or admit the superiority of the single tax in this respect.

It is just, in the second place, because it discourages land monopoly. Landlordism constitutes one of the serious social and economic problems before the people of Illinois to-day. From the 1910 census report we quote the following facts: Illinois farms are constantly increasing in size. In the decade preceding 1910, the size of the average farm increased five acres, and this in face of the fact that the population during the same period increased more than eight hundred thousand. In other words, a smaller per cent. of people own the land to-day, in the State of Illinois, than ever before. Forty-one and four-tenths per cent. of the farmers are tenants. This is an increase of one-third of the total number thirty years ago. For the next eighty-five years, if the present rate of increase should continue, every man on an Illinois farm will be a tenant. An increased tenantry means a transient rural population; resulting in a decreased efficiency of church and school and an impoverished soil.

The proposed system will remedy this present tendency to landlordism, first by making it easier for the tenant to purchase land. He can secure land more readily because the landlord, whose profits have been reduced by the single tax, will be more willing to sell. He will be more able to purchase because he is free from all burden of taxation. Second, it will encourage the landowner to remain upon his own farm. For instance, if a man having twenty thousand dollars to invest puts fifteen thousand dollars of it into land, and five thousand dollars into

improvements and stock and implements for the cultivation of this land, he gets a larger return upon the capital invested, as well as being exempt from taxation upon one fourth of his property. If, on the other hand, he invests the entire twenty thousand dollars in land which he rents to a tenant, he gets less return from his investment and pays a tax upon one-third more capital. Thus the proposed system will encourage the landowner to live upon his own farm.

Again, the single tax system discourages land speculation, because it makes it unprofitable to hold land out of use awaiting an increase in value. In one city a manufacturing plant expanded in such a way as to completely surround a certain lot which had been worth before the construction of the plant, \$4,000. The lot became necessary to the manufacturer and its value was greatly enhanced by the location of his plant. The owner of the lot refused to sell for a reasonable price. He held this land out of use until the manufacturer was forced to pay four times the former value of the lot. Now the factory had made this enormous value. Under the proposed system a tax would be placed upon a rent based upon this value and would be so high that the speculator would be forced to turn his land into channels of production much sooner. Thus the holding of lots in cities awaiting the inevitable rise in value; the hampering of the easy expansion of industry; the preventing of laborers from living near their work or crowding them together in the tenement sections of our great cities; all these evil effects of land speculation will disappear.

Again the proposed system discourages land monopoly because the monopolist cannot shift the burden of taxation to his tenant. Taxation upon other kinds of property, houses for example, may be shifted because the rent depends upon supply and demand. For unless the rent covers both the tax and the interest on the money invested the supply will be held stationary until the increasing demand forces the rent high enough to pay the interest on the investment plus the tax. But in the case of land, since the supply is always stationary, the rent is as high as the demand will permit. The tax upon the rental value, therefore, can only be taken from the landlord's profits. Professor Seligman, professor of political economy and finance in Columbia University, says: "He has no means of shifting it, for if the tax were to be suddenly abolished he would nevertheless be able to extort the same rent, since the ground rent is fixed solely by the demand of the occupiers. The tax simply diminishes his profits. Virtually all writers since Ricardo agree that the tax will fall wholly upon the landowner."

Third: It is just, because it promotes social welfare, that is, it improves the condition of society as a whole. It brings the greatest good to the largest number of people. It would hasten the abolition of the liquor traffic. In every local option campaign practically the only argument advanced for retaining the saloon is that the city would lose the revenue derived from the licenses. It is evident that public opinion in the main is opposed to the liquor traffic and tolerates it only because the revenue derived obscures the moral issue. Remove this

argument by the single tax and how long will the people, face to face with the moral issue, tolerate the licensed saloon?

By reducing tenantry it would produce a marked improvement in country life. No one denies that a permanent resident farming population where each farmer owns his own farm, makes a progressive community. Schools and churches are more efficient because the interest of the patrons is permanent. Community is fostered, the fertility of the soil is maintained and a social life is developed. Can we doubt the justice of a system of taxation which fosters the development of such a rural life as forms the very foundation of the prosperity of any commonwealth?

The proposed system would promote social welfare by benefiting all classes economically. By removing the restriction upon the tools of production it would increase manufacturing activity. Suppose a man has \$100,000 to invest in a manufacturing plant. He is equally free to build in Indiana or Illinois. If he builds in Indiana he will pay a tax upon all the capital invested but if he builds in Illinois, he pays a tax only on the land upon which his plant stands. In which will a level-headed business man build his factory? Is it not evident that he and scores of others will invest their capital where it will be taxed the least?

With this incoming capital, new fields of labor will be opened. This means greater prosperity for what we call "the laboring class." Greater prosperity for them means greater purchasing power and, therefore, a greater

demand with better prices for farm products. Thus all classes would be economically benefited. The single tax, therefore, would promote social welfare. First, because it would hasten the abolition of the liquor traffic. Second, because it would produce a marked improvement in country life. Third, by stimulating industry would benefit all classes economically.

Honorable Judges, I have proved that the proposed system is just: First, because it remedies double taxation; second, because it discourages land monopoly; third, because it promotes social welfare.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, RAYBORN LINDLEY ZERBY, EUREKA
COLLEGE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opponents, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first affirmative speaker has proved that the system of single tax is sound, my second colleague has shown that it is just, and I shall now prove that it is practicable.

The proposed system is practicable because it remedies the defects of the present system. The weaknesses of our present system are a matter of common knowledge. They spring from an antiquated tax law, formulated when economic conditions were primitive, when Illinois had no large cities and only a rural population. This law has not been materially revised in forty years, in spite of the fact that tax experts have repeatedly recommended revision. In the late seventies, in 1886, in 1894, in 1896, in 1898, and in 1910, commissioners, appointed for that purpose, advised our state legislators to pass new tax

laws, but none were enacted. Because of this failure to meet changing economic conditions with an adequate tax system, many glaring defects have resulted.

First among these is the cumbersome and expensive method of assessing and collecting the tax. It cannot be denied that a system that annually requires an assessor in every one of 1560 townships; more than a hundred county clerks devoting the most of their time to the preparation and correction of the assessors' books; more than a hundred county boards of review, trying to eliminate the injustices which arise; a State Board of Equalization, consisting of twenty-five high salaried members, vainly attempting to equalize assessments on various kinds of property; to say nothing of the three hundred and eighty-seven different taxing bodies in Cook County alone; and a whole army of collectors to gather the tax — it cannot be denied that such a system is cumbersome. Furthermore, it costs us almost three millions of dollars every year to levy and collect the tax. The proposed system remedies these defects by decreasing the amount of property to be assessed and the number of assessments to be made. Whereas, at present it takes an assessor about four weeks each year or sixteen weeks in four years to list the property, it would require but one week under the system of single tax. Thus the time actually consumed would be reduced to one-sixteenth of that now required and the cost of assessing would be only one-sixteenth of the present amount. At present the collectors receive two per cent. of the money collected. This comparatively large per cent. is necessary, because

under the present system, a large number of small sums is collected. Under the proposed system, because a smaller number and larger amounts are collected, the collectors could work profitably on a smaller per cent.

The present system is defective, in the second place, because it encourages dishonesty. Tax dodging has become a national pastime. Much of the tangible property and practically all of the intangible property escapes taxation. The law requires every assessor to ask this question of every man assessed: "Have you any money in the bank?" The report of the Comptroller of Currency of the United States and the report of the Auditor of Public Accounts of the State of Illinois show how this question has been answered. In 1912 the amount of deposits in the state and national banks in the State of Illinois was over \$950,000,000. The amount returned to the assessors that year was about forty-five million dollars. Only one dollar out of every twenty-one was taxed. Conditions in 1912 were not unusual. At no time since 1889 have the assessors secured more than one dollar out of thirteen and one year during that period they listed only one dollar out of thirty. Dishonesty is the rule rather than the exception. It is more prevalent in Cook County than elsewhere. There the ratio is one dollar taxed out of every sixty-two in the bank. Let it be remembered that the deposits in private banks and the money represented by trust deeds are not included in this calculation. If their amount could be determined and added to the deposits in the state and national banks, the percentage of intangible property escaping taxation

would be greatly increased. It is easily seen that a tax upon land, a tangible property, removes this temptation to dishonesty.

The present system has many other glaring defects, such as the numerous forms of double taxation; the shifting of taxes; the restriction of industry and the like. My colleagues have already mentioned these and shown the application of the single tax to the remedying of these defects. I shall not deal with them further, except to say, that these defects must be remedied if we are to have a system of taxation worthy of the name, and to maintain also, that the single tax on rental values is the most practical system yet devised for the remedying of these outstanding weaknesses. Furthermore, we insist that the affirmative in this debate must either bring forth adequate remedies for these defects or admit the superiority of the single tax.

The proposed system is practicable, in the second place, because it would be adequate without unduly burdening the man who uses his land. We base our proof of this statement upon the 1910 report of the State Board of Equalization. The amount of taxes now raised in this state is about one hundred million dollars. The assessed valuation of the land from which this amount would be raised is about twelve hundred million dollars, which is, of course, but one-sixth of its real value. In order to raise this amount of tax from the land, it would be necessary to levy a tax of one and one-third per cent. Is there any one who would be bold enough to declare that one and one-third per cent. equals the rental value of the land

or that such an assessment would be confiscatory in its nature? We contend that such a tax would not be more than the landowner should pay because of the peculiar benefits which he receives from society. It is turning back to society a part of that which society has created.

Honorable Judges, the system we are proposing is by no means an innovation. A quarter of a century ago, New Zealand adopted the tax on land. It worked so well that the authorities in eighty-five districts inaugurated it for raising the local revenue. Then Australia took it up and Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia, as well as the federal government adopted the system, with the result that large tracts of land held for grazing purposes were transformed into thriving farms. The German Empire tried it out by placing a tax of six per cent. upon land, exclusive of improvements, in one of its colonies in China and it worked so well that Frankfort and Cologne in the Fatherland enacted a similar increment tax and four hundred and fifty municipalities followed in their wake. Then the German Empire adopted it as a national measure. It took root in America and three of the nine provinces of Canada adopted it and in a neighboring province three hundred municipalities have petitioned for the right to enact such a law. In British Columbia all the important urban and many of the rural municipalities now exempt improvements entirely, thus raising practically all local revenues from land. In the Province of Alberta fifty-two municipalities, seventy-four villages and forty-four out of the forty-six towns established the tax on land

only. The same year by provincial enactment all towns, rural municipalities, and villages except two were required to raise their local revenues by taxes assessed upon land. In Saskatchewan all rural municipalities raise their revenue by a tax upon land alone and there is a special provincial tax upon uncultivated lands. Can any reasonable man deny that a system of taxation that has been adopted in almost five thousand administrative units under such different conditions as prevail in Australia, and New Zealand, in China, Germany, and Canada, and is working so successfully that the surrounding places are adopting it—I say—can any reasonable man deny that it has worked?

Honorable Judges, we have proved that the State of Illinois should inaugurate a system of single tax based on rental value. Such a system is sound in principle, because it does not restrict industry, because it taxes property that returns no other benefits to society, because it reaches the unearned increment. It is just in application, because it remedies double taxation, because it discourages land monopoly, because it promotes social welfare. It is practical, because it remedies the weaknesses of the present system, because it is adequate, and because it has worked.

*EUREKA COLLEGE vs. ILLINOIS WESLEYAN
UNIVERSITY*

FIRST NEGATIVE, LEVETTE JAY DAVIDSON, EUREKA
COLLEGE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponents, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question for debate, as has been stated, is—"Resolved, that the State of Illinois should adopt a system of single tax based on rental values." Let it be remembered at the very outset of this debate that this is a practical question. We are discussing taxation, not a question of moral or social reform. Whatever social benefit might or might not follow from the adoption of the single tax, is secondary. It is not sufficient to try to justify the single tax by certain theoretical social benefits which it might bring. The issue in this debate is an economic one. For that reason the affirmative must confine themselves to the upholding of a system of taxation which will be a substitute for our present general property tax.

The single tax which they propose to substitute would raise all public revenues by the collection of part, or all, of the yearly rental value of land. In advocating the adoption of such a system the affirmative must prove that it would be superior to our present general property tax; that it would be adequate to meet the needs of the government, both state and local; that it would be just and equitable; that it is practical in its workings, and that it has such superior advantages over any other system of

taxation which might be proposed that its adoption could not be reasonably questioned. It is not enough for the affirmative to point out abuses in the present system or to decry certain social inequalities and injustices which may exist at the present time. They must assume the burden of proving that the single tax is beyond all question the one our state should adopt.

We of the negative are opposed to the single tax for reasons which we believe to be fundamentally sound. We are opposed to the proposed system—First, because it is based upon a false theory; second, because it is based upon false economy; and third, because as a system it is false in practice. The first of these arguments I shall maintain, and the other two will be upheld by my colleagues, in the order named.

The single tax is false in theory for two all important reasons: First, because it violates the fundamental principle of taxation, and second, because it violates the fundamental principle of justice. It violates the fundamental principle of taxation in that it fails to conform to the great canon of taxation, that each individual shall contribute to the support of the government in proportion to his ability to pay. Upon this principle practically all economists are agreed. It is the principle upon which our present system of taxation is based, for one of the best evidences of ability to pay is the total amount of property which one possesses and which may consist either of lands, buildings, livestock, merchandise, credits, stocks and bonds, etc. Certainly a man's ability to support the government can be measured by his ability to

support himself. As Professor Seligman of Columbia University says, "We pay taxes not because we get benefits from the state but because we owe our support to the state as much as to ourselves or family." We believe that this principle of ability to pay is so well established that it does not need further argument. However, our opponents may say that this principle is violated by our present system because many forms of property escape taxation and many individuals dodge their just share of the governmental burden. But, such an argument is begging the question for it has to do with law enforcement, rather than with the question of the principle of taxation. We of the negative shall propose later on certain remedies whereby tax-dodging will be largely eliminated.

The single tax fails to conform to that canon of taxation that all should pay in proportion to ability, for it taxes individuals only in proportion to the rental value of the land which they may own. It thus frequently would tax the poor man's land, and would exempt the rich man's personal property which consists of skyscrapers, factories, palatial residences, etc. It goes on the false assumption that the amount of land that a man may own is a direct indication of the taxes he is able to pay. Honorable Judges, you recognize the fact that it would not be difficult to find a man who owns little land, but who, nevertheless, is very rich because of large personal holdings; or, on the other hand, to find a relatively poor man whose entire possessions are in land. And what shall we say of the poor farmer who owns just enough land to make a living for himself and family?

Certainly, to tax such a man while at the same time exempting Montgomery & Ward, Sears & Roebuck and such other corporations, would be a violation of the principle of ability to pay, not to say anything of its gross injustice. Thus the single tax violates the fundamental principle of taxation.

Not only does the single tax violate the fundamental principle of taxation but it also violates the fundamental principle of justice. First, because it discriminates against one of the elements of production. There are three elements in the production of wealth — labor, capital and land. This system seeks to tax the one, but it exempts the other two. Labor and capital should also bear some of the burden, for there are socially created values in them as well as in land, and to assume that land is the only commodity which has a socially created value, is false. Furthermore, to assume that land has a value aside from labor and capital is equally false. For, as my colleague will show, a large part of the present value of land is due to the capital and labor expended upon it, and without these two elements it would have little or no rental value. It is, therefore, inconsistent to maintain that land should be taxed and that the other products of capital and labor should go free. If land values are legitimate bases for taxation because they are socially created, why not the store, factory, railroad, telephone, and a thousand other forms of wealth which depend upon society for their value and which are the products of labor and capital? All three of these agen-

cies of production and whatever is created by them, should alike bear the burden of taxation.

Furthermore, the single tax violates the principle of justice in that it discriminates against a single class of society. It places all the burden of the local and state government upon the landowner. Only about one-third of our population owns any land whatsoever. Thus one-third of our population would be forced to bear the burden of the other two-thirds. Professor Seligman says on page seventy-seven of his "Essay on Taxation"— "If anything has been gained by the revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and by the growing public conscience of the nineteenth, it is a recognition of the fact that all owe a duty to support the state, that a system of wholesale exemptions is iniquitous, and that all taxpayers should be treated according to the same standard." Judged by any or all of these tests, can it be maintained that the single tax is a just form of taxation?

The injustice of making one class bear all the burden of taxation is the more ridiculous when we understand that the landowner would be compelled to pay the taxes which the rich corporations now pay. Take the Wabash Railroad, in the State of Illinois, for example. At present this railroad is paying taxes on twenty-eight million dollars' worth of property. Under the proposed system it would pay taxes only upon its land. In the 1913 report of the State Assessors in the Railroad Table on page 118, we find that the Wabash Railroad owns a right of way 668 miles in extent. By counting this land to be

four rods in width; which is a liberal estimate, we find that it amounts to less than five and one-half thousand acres. Even granting that this land, unimproved, would be worth \$175 per acre, we find that it would furnish a basis of a value of less than a million dollars for taxation. After adding the value of city and town lots belonging to the Wabash Railroad we find that instead of paying taxes on twenty-eight millions, it would be paying on the rental value of less than one and one-third million dollars' worth of land. Honorable Judges, would it be just to ask the landowner to pay the taxes of this great corporation?

Again, the injustice of placing the burden upon a single class is the more intolerable because it places the minority at the mercy of the majority. For the two-thirds who pay no taxes could place any burden of taxation which they chose upon the other third. Such a procedure violates the very essence of true democracy. It would be difficult to imagine a more unjust piece of class legislation than the single tax would prove itself to be. Hence, the proposed system violates the fundamental principle of justice.

In conclusion, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen, we of the negative have proved that the single tax on rental values is false in theory. First, because it is opposed to the fundamental principle of taxation according to ability to pay, and second, because it is opposed to the fundamental principle of justice. It unjustly singles out land, one of the elements of production, and frees the other two, labor and capital, from their fair

portion of the burden of taxation. It unjustly discriminates against a single class of society, compelling the landowner to pay the taxes for the rich corporation. Assuredly the State of Illinois should not adopt a system of taxation based upon such falseness and injustice.

SECOND NEGATIVE, RALPH ELBERT STRINGER, EUREKA
COLLEGE, '16

Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker on the negative has proved to you that the proposed system is based upon a false theory because it is contrary to the fundamental principle of taxation, and because it violates the fundamental principle of justice. I shall now prove that the proposed system is based upon false economy.

In the first place we maintain that the single tax is based upon false economy because a tax based upon the rental value of the land alone would be inadequate to meet the demands of the government. Let it be remembered that we are not discussing a system which shall be applied to any one community nor even to a large municipality alone, but that the gentlemen of the affirmative are proposing a system which shall be statewide in its application. Even if such a tax could be made adequate to meet the needs in some of the richer sections of our state, there would still be numerous sections where it would be totally inadequate. As a case in point let us select one of the poorer counties in southern Illinois. In Pulaski County the average farm is forty acres. The total average income from such a farm is less than five hundred dollars, even at the present high price of pro-

duce. If from this amount the cost of production be deducted, one will readily see that the farmer is receiving far less than a fair daily wage for his labor.

Let it be remembered also, Honorable Judges, that the gentlemen of the affirmative are proposing a tax which shall be based upon rental value alone. Henry George, Marshall, Seager, Walker, Taussig, Ricardo and other economists have agreed upon the following definition for rent. "The economic rent of a piece of land is found by subtracting from the amount of its annual produce an amount sufficient to return the farmer's outlay with profit." According to this definition of rent, the land to which we refer would have no rental value whatever; therefore no taxes could be levied upon it; hence no income with which to meet the needs of the government.

The conditions in Pulaski County are not exceptional but obtain in a large part of the southern section of the state. It is also true in certain northern sections. Now if the affirmative still insist upon levying a tax upon this land they would go beyond the terms of the question for they could not confine themselves to rental value (which is the only value with which this question has to do), but would levy a tax upon the cash value. In fact, the single tax would be broken down and would become a general property tax.

But we do not have to confine ourselves to the poorer sections of the state to prove that the single tax would be inadequate. Let us take some of the older municipalities (which are the rule in the greater part of the state),

where the town has seemingly reached its maximum growth, and where there has been little or no increase in population during the last decade. In most of these communities we find a steady decrease in the selling value of land. In such a community there is little or no demand for building sites either for business or residence purposes. In such a municipality one can find numerous vacant lots that have no rental value because there is no demand for them, and those who own them cannot dispose of them. Other lots upon which buildings are constructed, were they unoccupied, would have no more rental value than those that are now vacant. As Taussig points out, "Rent is the surplus over and above what is necessary to induce investment." Whatever rental value these lots now have is due to the improvements and not to the land itself. Honorable Judges, is it reasonable to suppose that in such a municipality, the rental value of the bare land even if it were all taken, would be sufficient to meet the needs of the government,— to pay for paving, to pay off water bonds, to build new school buildings, and to support the public school system? Such a proposition is preposterous.

Not only would it fail to meet the present needs but it would be inadequate to meet the ever increasing needs of the local and state governments; thus proving itself not only to be inadequate but to be inelastic as well. Whatever merits a tax system may or may not have, it must at least possess the merit of being elastic. Without elasticity there is no progress. Honorable Judges,

do we wish to inaugurate a system which will be insufficient to meet the present needs, which would place an impossible handicap upon all future growth?

In the second place, the single tax is based upon false economy because in order to be made adequate it must be made confiscatory. As has already been shown there are many counties and municipalities where the single tax would be totally inadequate, if, indeed, it would be adequate in any. In order to make the single tax adequate it must be made to exceed the rental value of the land and to levy a tax upon the selling value. If this is done then the selling value of that land will be forced down to the vanishing point. A man must have interest on his investment or it is worthless. Such an act would, in its very nature, be an act of confiscation. But if our opponents try to say that as long as land has any selling value it still has rental value, the point still holds good that they must levy a tax upon the selling value to get sufficient income, and whichever horn of the dilemma they may choose, the single tax will lead to confiscation. In fact, most of the single taxers are frank enough to admit that confiscation is not only the result of the single tax but that it is the aim for which they are working. Henry George's theory was evolved as a means of removing land from private ownership and nearly all the single taxers since his time have adhered to that fundamental proposition. They admit that the reason the scheme is advocated, is to tax the landowner out of his existence.

Now, in order to prove that the single tax will lead to confiscation let us take the town of Eureka, Illinois. We

take these figures because they were the most available to us. The conditions in Eureka are typical of all the nearby towns. The assessed valuation of the personality and realty is \$323,000. Upon this property total taxes to the amount of \$21,000 are levied. This \$21,000 does not include paving taxes, sidewalk assessments, etc. The assessors' estimate of the value of the bare land is \$210,000. Now if this same \$21,000 were raised from the real value of the bare land, to say nothing of its rental value, it would take ten per cent. of that value annually, which means that the entire value of the land would be consumed in ten years. In order to show that we are not dealing in hypothetical conditions let us take one instance of the application of the single tax. In Edmonton, Canada, where the single tax was in operation, the land confiscated by the government for nonpayment of taxes amounted to \$1,200,000. So far as Eureka is concerned the single tax would either be inadequate on the one hand or confiscatory on the other. If the affirmative admit the first alternative, viz., that it would be inadequate they admit that the single tax would be a failure; if they admit the second alternative, viz., that it would lead to confiscation they then must show why it is consistent to destroy the private ownership of land and still retain the private ownership of other forms of property. Most of all they must show why it is consistent to retain the private ownership of railroads, of telegraph systems, of telephone systems, public utilities, for according to the proposed system they go almost wholly untaxed. They take away from the farmer his home earned by years of

hard labor and retain to the magnate his steel trust, his sugar trust, his skyscraper or his traction system. To confiscate the capital invested in land, while exempting absolutely the capital invested in corporate or industrial securities is a travesty on justice. It will be impossible to convince the people that such a travesty should be enacted.

That the effect of the single tax would be confiscation is upheld by practically all economists who have written on the subject. Professor Seager of Columbia in his "Principles of Economics," page 528 says, "Any single tax is undesirable. It would lead to the wholesale confiscation of property. Even if such a tax were admirable in other respects neither a rent tax or any other tax is desirable as a single tax." Professor Gide of the Paris Law School says in his "Principles of Political Economy," page 617, "The confiscation of rent by taxation will have the same effect as the confiscation of land itself. It would destroy the value of land as such and give rise to the necessity of paying an indemnity to the present owners." On page 366 of "Outlines of Economics," written by Professor Ely of the University of Wisconsin, we find, "The confiscation of rent, or even if it may be called by so gentle a term as the appropriation of rent by the public without compensation will never appeal to the conscience of the American people as a just thing." Professor Walker, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology says on page 418 of his "Political Economy," "It would be robbery for the state to assert its rights under the single tax." And Professor Selig-

man of Columbia said in the March number of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science* and in his essays on taxation, "I am not a single taxer, indeed I am far from it, for the single tax is neither equitable nor just since it leads to confiscation."

Honorable Judges, there is one class of people for whom the single tax has no attraction. With possibly one or two exceptions the economists all unite in the condemnation of a theory which they maintain to be as absurd as it is impracticable, in which they can see nothing but injustice and inequality, and in which they recognize grave theoretical, economic and practical defects.

To summarize: The single tax is based upon false economy, because in a greater part of the state it would be inadequate to meet the needs of the government, and because it leads to the confiscation of property with serious economic results.

THIRD NEGATIVE, CHESTER BENTON GRUBB, EUREKA
COLLEGE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponents, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My first colleague has proved that the single tax is false in theory, my second colleague has proved that the single tax is false in economy; it now devolves upon me to prove that it is false in practice.

A single tax is false in practice for two fundamental reasons. First, because it is impossible to ascertain the rental value of land. Under the proposed system we are to tax land according to its rental value only. There are

three factors which give land rental value: Capital, Labor and Social demands. These during the process of social development have become so involved that one finds it impossible to decide what part of the rental value is due to each of them. Improvements upon land in a large measure are the products of labor and capital—such improvements as buildings, fences, tilling, fertilization, etc. Without these improvements a farm would have practically no rental value. The difference between the rental value of the virgin soil and its present rental value is largely due to labor and capital.

One of the main arguments of the affirmative is that the single tax would exempt industry. Mr. George and other single taxers base their defense of private property in commodities other than land on this theory; but gentlemen, how can land have any value without labor? Land values do not arise spontaneously. Rental values do not come forth from the land itself. We ask our opponents to point out by what means they would separate the rental value which the presence of labor and capital have contributed from the rental value contributed by the virgin soil. Let us take a piece of swamp land which to-day is worth nothing; labor and capital drain that swamp; they add certain necessary chemical elements to the soil; they fence the land; put buildings upon it and finally give to it a productive value. How would our single taxers determine the rental value of such land? The truth is that if they taxed it at all, they would be taxing industry and checking improvements—the very thing which they propose not to do. Thus we see that it is impossible to

ascertain the rental value of land apart from the rental value that labor adds to it. And it is equally impossible to tax land upon any present rental value it may have without taxing industry.

But if our opponents can prove in theory that they can determine rental values, it is a theory only for it has yet to be tried in practice. Even where the single tax has been tried in America, it has been levied on land values and not on rental values, and in such instances it has failed to work satisfactorily. Vancouver, Lethbridge, Regina, Medicine Hat, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Edmonton and several Canadian cities have a form of the single tax. Probably Edmonton comes more nearly having the single tax than any of the cities named. In that city a tax is levied on land values. In five years the assessed land values of Edmonton were increased four fold. In one year one million two hundred thousand dollars' worth of land was sold by the state for nonpayment of taxes. After a trial of five years the entire province of Alberta repealed the single tax and returned to the old system. Take Vancouver as another instance; here again taxes are levied on land values. Vancouver has an income from licenses, such as saloon license, of \$700,000. It pays nothing to the support of the Provincial Government. While the Provincial Government pays \$340 on the salary of each school teacher in the city. Even with all this extra income from licenses and school support from the state, the taxes on land in Vancouver within two years have increased more than one hundred per cent. Of the nine cities in Canada which

have tried the single tax only one has had an increase in building permits. If we compare the building permits granted in 1913, with those granted in 1912 there was an average decrease of forty-three per cent. On the other hand, during the same period of time, Montreal, Fort Williams, and Toronto, which are operating under the old system of taxation, had an increase in building permits of twelve and one-half per cent.

In Houston, Texas, they have a plan of taxing land at its fair value and assessing the improvements upon land at twenty-five per cent. of their value. This plan exempts from tax, notes, mortgages, and all evidences of debt and all cash and personal property. This system is not the system proposed by the affirmative in this debate, but it will serve to show the disastrous results which would follow if an exclusive land tax were adopted. After two years of application in Houston, an examination of figures discloses the fact that bank deposits increased over \$9,000,000 in the two years preceding the partial adoption of the single tax, and less than \$1,600,000 following its adoption. This was an actual decrease of eighty-two per cent. There has also been a gradual decrease in building permits. Compare the first six months of 1914 with the first six months of 1913 and there was a decrease of more than thirty per cent. However, at the same time that Houston was having this decrease in bank deposits and building permits, Fort Worth, Dallas, and San Antonio have had a better growth in building progress and bank deposits than Houston. Honorable Judges, is it safe to adopt a tax system which has

proved itself to be so impractical in places where it has been tried?

But our opponents have had much to say about the weaknesses of the present system and have sought to justify this radical single tax by proposing it as a remedy for these weaknesses. We admit some of these weaknesses but believe there is a more practical way of dealing with them than the adoption of the single tax. My opponents have tried to make much of our present double taxation. The State of Nebraska has largely solved this problem so far as taxing both real estate and mortgages is concerned, by passing a law which permits the owner of the property and the holder of the mortgage to agree between themselves as to who shall pay the taxes. In case no such agreement is made the property is taxed and the mortgage is exempt. Similar laws could be passed correcting every form of double taxation. Also our opponents have had much to say about tax dodging. The State of Missouri has gotten at the root of this problem by passing a law requiring the Assessor's stamp upon all papers demanding money. Unless a note or mortgage bears this stamp it cannot be collected. Our worthy opponents would also have you believe there is much dishonesty in the present method of assessment. I ask you, would the enactment of a mere system to be put into practice by the same people make those people any more efficient? In other words would the adoption of the single tax change human nature? Men will take advantage of taxing laws so long as human nature remains selfish.

There is not a single element of weakness in the present system which can not be removed by legislation, and as a substitute for the proposed single tax, we advocate the adoption of these tax reforms and remedies which have been proposed for the State of Illinois by the specially appointed Tax Commission. This Commission has rendered its report after long and painstaking research. There is not a single weakness in our present taxing laws, either by way of assessment, collection, double taxation, etc., for which they have not proposed a remedy. The changes which they advocate are nearly all based upon the experiences of sister states which have laws dealing with certain particular defects. Some of these remedies I have already indicated. Our honorable opponents have not brought forth a single shortcoming in our present system, which has escaped the notice of this commission. We shall deal more fully with these proposals in our rebuttal speeches. For the present it is sufficient to ask, shall we abandon a system which may be made efficient and adopt one which is the dream of a few impractical idealists?

Furthermore, be it noted, Honorable Judges, that the proposed remedies are in line with constructive legislation. We are not proposing some revolutionary scheme which could not be instituted without a disturbance of our whole economic and industrial system such as the single tax would prove itself to be. We are advocating a reform, not a revolution. The remedies which we advocate could be adopted so gradually and by such legislative enactment as has already been made in other states, that no

panic, or depreciation of values, or social injustice would accrue thereby. Our present system is not inherently bad, nor past redemption. It takes only such changes as a wise tax commission has suggested to make it equitable, adequate, general, and practicable in every respect.

Honorable Judges, we have proved that the proposed system is false in theory, because it is contrary to the theory that a man should pay tax according to his ability, and because it is unjust. Second: We have proved that it is false economy, because it leads to confiscation and is inadequate. We have proved that it is false in practice because one cannot ascertain the rental value and that it has failed where it has been tried. We have also proved that the present system may be easily remedied so that whatever weaknesses or injustices now exist will largely be eliminated and that such remedies are easily adopted. For these reasons we believe that the single tax should not be adopted by the State of Illinois.

EUREKA COLLEGE BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Essays on Taxation. Seligman.
Distribution of Wealth. Carver.
Natural Taxation. Thos. G. Sherman.
Encyclopedia of Social Reform. Bliss.
Dictionary of Political Economy. Vols. II and III.—Palgrave.
The Unearned Increment. W. K. Dawson.
Principles of Economics. Seligman, pp. 360 ff.
Principles of Political Economy, pp. 616 ff. Gide.
Outlines of Economics, p. 366 ff. Ely.
Principles of Economics, pp. 481 ff. Seager.
Principles of Economics. Vol. II, p. 515 ff. Taussig.

The Wealth of Nations, Book V, Ch. 2. Adam Smith.
Progress and Poverty. Henry George.
The Land Question. Henry George.
Political Economy. President Walker.

REPORTS

Report of Comptroller of Currency, United States.
Report of Auditor of Public Accounts of Illinois.
Report of State Board of Equalization of Illinois.
1913 Report of State Assessors.
Report of a Convention on Taxation. University of Washington.
History of the General Property Tax in Illinois. Haig, University of Illinois publications.
Report of the State Board of Equalization of Illinois. 1915.
Annals of the American Academy of Political Science. Mch., 1915.
The Case Against the Single Tax. *Atlantic Monthly.* 113, 27-37.
A. S. Johnson.
The Single Tax in Western Canada. *Harper's W.* 58:10.
McRoy.
Report of the Illinois Tax Commission.
United States Census Reports. 1910.

PAMPHLETS

The A, B, C of Taxation. Fillebrown.
The Case Plainly Stated. Ring.
The Single Tax and the Farmer. Shearman.
Unearned Increments. Joseph Fels.
The Single Tax and the Farmer. Joseph Fels.
Extracts from George and Shearman, published under the name of
"The Shortest Road to the Single Tax."
Taxation of Land Values. Berens & Singer.
These were actually used in the preparation of the speeches.

**GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF
MERCHANT MARINE**

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF MERCHANT MARINE

*UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
FRESHMEN vs. UNIVERSITY OF RED-
LANDS (Senior Team).*

The University of Southern California Freshmen team whose speeches are given in the following pages entered five debates during the school year, three of them on the Government Ownership of the Merchant Marine subject. The first debate on this question was won unanimously from the Los Angeles Junior College; the second resulted in a two to one victory over the Throop College of Technology, and the third, with the University of Redlands (held in Redlands, May 22, 1915), was won unanimously. The University of Southern California had the affirmative side throughout these debates. The speeches given here are the final draft of the arguments that won the series for them. The negative speeches are those of the University of Redlands team.

The question was stated,

Resolved, that government ownership would be the best method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.

The speeches of both teams were contributed to Intercollegiate Debates by the debaters in order to get in print a debate on a subject that is new, important, and still prominent in the national councils.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF MERCHANT MARINE

*UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
FRESHMEN vs. UNIVERSITY OF RED-
LANDS (Senior team)*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, REUEL L. OLSON, UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, '18

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponents, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are here this evening to discuss certain methods of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States. For many years the inadequacy of our merchant marine has been the cause of a great deal of discussion and concern. Previous to the present European War, over ninety per cent. of our foreign trade was carried in foreign bottoms — we had not the ships with which to carry it. Now we are suffering from the withdrawal of those ships from the ordinary pursuits of business, and we find our cotton, our corn, and our merchandise stored in warehouses when these goods should be in the hands of the consumer. It is evident then, that there is need of a suitable means of shipping. The wording of the question for debate grants that need. The point in contention is

— what is the best method of supplying the needed shipping facilities. In other words, we are debating the desirability of a certain method as a means to the end of meeting an admitted need. Whether or not the immediate transfer of all privately owned steamship lines would be necessary under government ownership, does not necessarily enter into this discussion to-night. If government ownership, as a method, possesses certain desirable qualities and characteristics which are lacking in all other methods, then government ownership is undoubtedly the most desirable method. We of the affirmative believe that government ownership, although perhaps not perfect in every detail, is the most desirable method for improving our ocean transportation facilities. Our burden of proof is to show that government ownership, of all other methods, is the best method to build up and operate an adequate United States merchant marine, and the task of the negative is to show wherein our arguments are faulty, and to advance a better method than government ownership.

In presenting the constructive argument for the affirmative, I shall first discuss certain methods, other than government ownership, which have been advocated and given a trial as means of improvement of our shipping, and still other methods which have been advocated but not yet tried. First among these is the employment of private capital at the initiative of the individual. Historical records show that private capital has continually had the opportunity of investment in the shipping business. However, the present condition of our merchant

marine shows that a sufficient amount has never been invested to give us a powerful shipping industry. The reasons for this may be many and varied but the significant fact about the entire matter is that private capital has failed to give us an adequate merchant marine.

But there are other methods which some people say would insure a powerful shipping industry. We frequently hear it said that by the payment of subsidies our merchant marine would be placed upon a sound basis. The fact of the matter is, however, that subsidies never contributed to the up-building of any merchant marine, nor have subsidies ever aided in the successful operation of any merchant marine. There are still other individuals who argue that the use of discriminating duties would be an impetus to all ocean transportation of the United States. They do not bear in mind that discriminating duties would violate treaties with foreign nations, and would foster a spirit of enmity between the different countries. Again, there are those who advocate the amendment of our navigation laws in a way which would favor the shipping interests, in order that we might realize improvement in our means of sea transportation. Such individuals overlook the fact that the amendment of our navigation laws in a manner which would tend to make them less stringent, in addition to being impracticable, would lower the standards of American seamen.

In addition to these various methods, all of which have undesirable features, other more radical and undefined means for improving our merchant marine have been suggested. Among them we find a certain one which has the

creation of a federal board of control as its basis. This is undesirable because it is no real method of building up and operating our shipping, but is simply a means of controlling what already exists. We of the affirmative believe that in order to establish satisfactorily our merchant marine, more capital must be invested in the business. Government guarantee of shipping bonds has also been suggested as a possible means of improving this phase of our national activity. But if the government would guarantee the bonds of the shipping industry, other forms of business would demand governmental indorsement of their corporation bonds and thus the government would be made to bear the financial brunt of all business.

In upholding the affirmative of this question, we admit that methods other than government ownership, and other than those which I have now enumerated and considered, might possibly be proposed by the gentlemen of the opposition. But the foregoing methods, in all of which I have pointed out serious defects, are, according to Secretary McAdoo, the methods other than government ownership, to which consideration is due. He states,— “The only practicable suggestion that has yet been made for the improvement of our merchant marine is found in direct governmental action.”

In order that we may deal fairly with the question before us, let us now consider a fundamental principle of all merchant marine improvement, viz,—the upbuilding and operation of a merchant marine is properly a governmental function. Ocean shipping is primarily a national activity. Merchant marine improvement is a

vital policy of national importance because the prosperity of every individual is determined, to a certain extent, by the condition of ocean transportation. Markets for every product of every kind of American labor can be reached only through the agency of the national merchant marine. Furthermore, ocean shipping is primarily a national activity because whenever any international complications arise, even from the actions of a privately owned vessel, the government must act as an arbiter. Again, the public utility of the sea can properly be utilized only by government ownership of shipping vessels for by no other method can this great public utility of the sea be made to serve the interests of all the people.

That ocean shipping is primarily a national activity is further shown by the fact that the government now spends money for safeguarding the traffic of the sea. The government spends the money of the entire people in safeguarding the traffic of the sea by the building of lighthouses, anchoring of buoys, and maintaining of life saving stations. In the light of these facts what claim have private shipping interests to profits made possible by the expenditure of the money of all the people? James Wesley Bryan of Washington states, "Why should private ship-owners take a toll from ocean traffic? The whole people have first to chart the waters by sweeping and safeguarding the channels. Then lighthouses and safeguards to navigation must be established and maintained at public expense, buoys have to be anchored and kept in place, life saving stations are necessary, and crews with ocean tugs must scout the shore, and be ever ready at

public expense to aid those in distress or peril. The harbors and landing places must be dredged or otherwise improved by jetties, sea-walls, and structures. American transportation is an American governmental function."

Considering this question from another point of view, we find that building up and operating a merchant marine through the agency of the government is but fulfilling a governmental obligation. A prominent advocate of government ownership of our merchant marine, the Secretary of the Treasury, in a recent speech before Congress said,—“Those who oppose government ownership seem to forget that it is the duty of the government to engage in any activity even of a business nature, which is demanded in the interest of all the people of the country, when it is impossible to engage private capital in such operations.” In other words, when private capital has had the opportunity to supply an industry needed in behalf of the interests of all the citizens of a nation and has failed in so doing, the duty of supplying that business devolves upon the government. Moreover, the government is responsible for supplying defense for its citizens. Let us supply a defense by the creation of a naval auxiliary of shipping vessels. In a discussion at a meeting of the Chicago Commercial Club this statement was made,—“Government ownership means the creation of a naval auxiliary which is indispensable if our navy is to be an effective instrument for the national defense.” Why should we maintain separate vessels, at public expense, to train our seamen for the service of their coun-

try? There is no justifiable reason for such action when we consider that if we would but allow the government to own our shipping vessels, the traffic rates and transportation charges would pay the bills. Again, government ownership and operation of our merchant marine fulfills a governmental responsibility in that it is a means of meeting the problem of unemployment. Under a system of government ownership, ship building in home yards would be established upon a paying basis.

Thus we find that the upbuilding and operation of our merchant marine is properly a governmental function; that ocean shipping is primarily a national activity, for proper utilization of the great public utility of the sea cannot be made unless it is under governmental supervision and control; that the governmental treasury is the proper depository for ocean transportation rates and charges because the government now spends the money of all the people in safeguarding the traffic of ocean highways; that governmental upbuilding and operation is necessary in order that the government might fulfill its obligation in fostering activities which are for the good of all the people and in supplying a defense by the creation of a naval auxiliary.

With these facts before us it is of interest to consider the sources of opposition to government ownership as a method of improving our shipping facilities. Who oppose government ownership? Shipping interests. Why do they oppose it? Because they realize that they will be forced to reduce their rates to a competitive basis. The *Outlook* for September 9, '14 contains these words.—

" Ship owners state that if the government engaged in the carrying trade, they (private ship-owning corporations) would be forced to lower their rates." Thus we find that the very source of opposition is an argument in favor of government ownership. But I hear you say, private capital has failed because of the stringency of our navigation laws. What are the requirements of our laws? They are requirements only strict enough to insure justice, decency, and self-respect among our sailors. If private interests find it necessary to lower the standards of American seamen to a level similar to that of cheap European labor, then there is all the more reason for governmental ownership.

Having thus found that all other methods possess serious defects which argue against their adoption, whereas the upbuilding and operation of a merchant marine is properly a governmental function, and having reflected upon the prejudiced opposition to the governmental ownership method, we of the affirmative cannot but believe that government ownership is the best method for building up and operating the United States merchant marine because, as stated in the *Washington Post* of February 1, 1915,— "The agriculturists need the services of a national marine, the manufacturers and merchants require it, the industrial workers of the country are now being embarrassed by the lack of it."

Finally then, Honorable Judges, the upbuilding and operation of the United States merchant marine is properly a governmental function. For years we have been waiting for other forces to develop this vital phase of

our economic activity. None have satisfactorily done so. What remains for us to do? We must allow the citizens of the United States, through their agent the government, to settle this question. The issue is an important one. The present is pregnant with much good or harm for the republic. If we will but recognize the true merits of government ownership, the present moment will be the turning point of time in the economic policies of this great government. It will be the incorporation of a policy which will be for the good of all the people, for the preservation of our institutions and for the general welfare of humanity. If we refuse we are but inviting a prolonged continuation of inadequate ocean transportation facilities. What is to be our decision? We of the affirmative believe that the citizens of the United States are willing and ready to decide in favor of government ownership, because all other methods have invariably failed to provide world markets for every product of American labor.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, FRED S. FIELD, UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, '18

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponents, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has set forth for your consideration the following propositions:

1. All methods except government ownership are defective and would be undesirable for building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.
2. Government ownership does not possess the defects of these other methods.

3. The ownership and operation of a merchant marine is essentially a governmental function.

In continuing the argument for the affirmative it shall be my purpose to show that government ownership possesses those merits that make it the best method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.

Let us first consider the benefits, economic and otherwise, that would be derived from a government owned and operated merchant marine. We have on the table Senate Doc. No. 673 which is composed of hundreds of letters from shipping concerns all over the United States, asserting that for years past private companies have charged exorbitant rates and thus materially hindered the expansion of our trade. The report of the proceedings of the merchant marine committee of the House shows also that the shipping combinations resort to very questionable methods to maintain their monopoly over the ocean transportation business. Secretary of Commerce, W. C. Redfield states, "that if common carriers on land were to practice such discriminations and adopt such arbitrary methods they would be subject to criminal prosecution."

We of the affirmative maintain that a government owned merchant marine would do away with such evils and allow the normal expansion of our commercial interests. We have a reasonable ground for such an assertion.

The United States is now and has for several years

past been operating a line of ships from New York to the canal zone with the highest degree of success. Mr. Drake, the vice president of the government company, stated in a letter to Congress, "that the average rate of freight between New York and the canal zone at the time the government took over the operation of the line was \$8 per ton. Under government operation this was reduced to \$4 per ton average, and, furthermore, the private lines were also forced to come down to this level as the shippers would not pay higher rates to the private lines than to the government line."

The economic benefit is evident. The government in this instance became a potent agency for reducing the rates to the normal level. Such a method allows the shippers of the country to transport their goods at reasonable prices, and as the lower transportation rate would reduce the total cost of the product, the consumers of the country would reap an economic benefit in lower prices.

Representative Hardy of Texas, before the house investigation committee, stated, "that many other benefits would be realized by government ownership and operation of the merchant marine. Among these would be the elimination of the freezing out of competitors, the breaking up of the shipping trust, the reduction of rates to a reasonable level, and the retention within the United States of vast amounts of American capital now being poured into Europe."

Having shown that the shipping combine by virtue of exorbitant rates and questionable methods, prohibits the normal expansion of our trade, that government owner-

ship would abolish this evil and benefit the whole nation economically, I will proceed to my next point: That government ownership is the only method by which an adequate merchant marine can ever be built up.

Private capital has failed to build up an adequate merchant marine. This cannot be disputed as ninety-eight per cent. of the foreign trade of the United States is carried in foreign ships. "Why," you ask, "does this condition exist?" Because, as Representative Beakes of Michigan tells us, "it is unprofitable for private capital to invest in the American shipping business, as the greater cost of operation under American registry does not guarantee the profits that other investments do." Private capital can never build up an adequate merchant marine. The higher standard of American living demands higher wages, this increases the operative cost and consequently cuts down on profits.

We have then two courses, outside of government ownership, that might be followed. We can either bolster up the merchant marine by applying some form of artificial stimulus or we can reduce the American standard of living by paying lower wages, cutting down on safeguards and the comfort of our seamen. My colleague has already taken up every form of artificial stimulus that has been advanced, such as subsidies, discriminating duties, and several others; and he has shown that every one of them is defective and undesirable. This the gentlemen of the negative have not denied. The other alternative, that of lowering the standard of American living I shall not even consider. Such a policy would mean the reduc-

ing of our labor to the European level. I hardly believe that the opposition would even consider such a policy as a constructive means of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.

We see then that private capital cannot build up an adequate merchant marine. The government, however, would be content with much smaller profits and consequently is the only agency for building up the sea power of the United States. As shown by the operation of the government owned Panama line the government could reduce the rates fifty per cent. and still make a net profit. All this could be accomplished without lowering the standard of American seamen.

Private capital cannot receive the profits in the shipping business that it can in other enterprises. Consequently, it has never built up an American merchant marine. The government does not demand the profits that private capital does. Therefore, the only possible means by which an adequate merchant marine will ever be built up is by government ownership and operation.

Having shown that government ownership would be economically beneficial, and that the only way by which our merchant marine will ever be adequately built up is by government ownership and operation; one more point remains. Is such a policy practicable? Can the United States operate the merchant marine efficiently and economically? I must again refer you to the government owned and operated Panama line. Senate Doc. No. 673, page 19, states, "In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914 there was a net revenue from the steamship line of

\$314,296, and in the four months ending October 31, 1914 there was a net revenue of \$84,294." And furthermore, remember that the government reduced the transportation charges fifty per cent.

Nor is the United States the only nation that has succeeded in government operation of the merchant marine. Representative James W. Bryan of Washington on January 19, 1915, in a speech before the House stated, "that the Russian government has successfully owned and operated merchant ships since 1895. The ministry of marine, a governmental department, has had extensive experience in operating merchant vessels."

Mr. Phillip Manson of New York, a man with large experience in the shipping business, in a letter addressed to the Chicago Journal of Commerce states in regard to this subject, "the government could operate the merchant marine and do it efficiently and economically."

Honorable Judges, there can be no doubt of the practicability of government ownership. Every government now operates its own battleships, cruisers, transports, colliers, and submarines. The operation of a merchant marine would differ in no particular and would afford innumerable commercial advantages. Furthermore, it cannot be claimed that the United States government is a poor executive. Look at the Panama Canal, the United States Post Office, the Parcel Post business, and the vast reclamation projects. The government operates a railroad at Panama, is building one in Alaska, operates coal mines, and engages in many and varied forms of commercial enterprises. Surely past experience proves that

the government could operate ships in the transportation business.

Because all other methods tried have failed, because other proposed methods are inadequate, because government ownership does not possess the defects of these other methods, because the ownership and operation of the merchant marine is properly a governmental function, because a government owned and operated marine would be a valuable naval auxiliary, because it would be an economic benefit to the whole nation, because it is the only method by which an adequate marine can ever be built up, and because government ownership and operation would be practical, efficient, and economical, we of the affirmative ask that you accept the resolution —

That government ownership is the best method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, R. L. OLSON, UNIVERSITY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, '18

Mr. Chairman, Worthy Opponents, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The members of the opposition have spent a great deal of time in asking a number of questions which the argument of my colleague, the second speaker of the affirmative, seemed peculiarly designed to answer.

My opponent, the second speaker of the negative, made several statements from which I conclude that he wishes definite and detailed information as to the method of operating a government owned merchant marine, as well

as to come to a more explicit understanding of details involved in obtaining a government owned marine. In order that he may have the desired information, I invite his attention to a bill which I hold in my hand, representative of many others, which is soon to be submitted to Congress. This bill authorizes the President to build, construct and equip ships to engage in the merchant marine business of the United States, and the same bill also explains plans for the operation of such vessels. If my opponent desires details he will find them incorporated in this bill. However, the details of the upbuilding and operation of a government owned merchant marine, represent but one of the minor considerations in this debate. It is unreasonable to suppose that the government is unable to carry on the shipping industry efficiently because, as proved by my colleague, undertakings of this nature have been attended with the greatest success. It is rather for us here to consider government ownership of our merchant marine in its entirety, as a method of improving and operating our shipping facilities. The question for debate has to do with methods of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States, and we of the affirmative are upholding government ownership as the best method for meeting this admitted need. In substantiation of our position, we have shown you that the shipping business is properly a governmental function and can be practiced successfully, as is shown by the experience of the Panama Railroad Steamship line.

In spite of the clear wording of the question, which

grants the need of improvement of our shipping facilities, our opponents have endeavored to argue that there is no need for a government owned merchant marine. They, however, have absolutely neglected to inform us of a better method than government ownership. In order to debate this question in any measure whatever, it is necessary that both affirmative and negative grant the need of improving the condition of our merchant marine. The question concerning us is,— how are we to improve and operate our shipping? We of the affirmative advocate government ownership because we find that this plan is wise economically since the experience of the Panama Railroad Steamship line shows that a reasonable profit can be made, that moderate freight rates will be insured, and that the whole country will be benefited.

One of the most strenuous objections of our opponents to government ownership as a method of improvement and operation of our shipping, is that the immediate purchase of all docks, wharves, and other appurtenances necessary to carry on the business, would cause a financial depression in this country. Undoubtedly it would be difficult to secure a sufficient amount of ready money to warrant the immediate transfer of all privately owned lines and property — but such action is not at all necessary. Let us again call to mind the question for debate —“best method of building up and operating.” No time limit is designated, and it stands to reason that the method requiring the least amount of time would not of necessity be the most desirable method. At any rate, ladies

and gentlemen, we will wait with the transference of these vast property holdings until this debate has been completed.

Turning now to a consideration of a suggestion made by the negative, i.e., that the use of discriminating duties would result in building up our merchant marine. We ask them how discriminatory duties would operate the merchant marine. They have failed to attempt to establish fifty per cent. of their case, and the remainder was left unsubstantiated. It is evident to the careful observer that government ownership as a method, surpasses the use of discriminating duties because a government owned marine could be used as a naval auxiliary in time of war, as an agency for training our seamen, as a fleet of colliers and transports, as an invaluable aid to our commerce, and as a method of improving the foreign mail service. Attorney General Gregory holds that discriminating duties are undesirable because "treaties with foreign nations would be violated." Speaking along the same line, Secretary McAdoo states,—"Even though treaties did not stand in the way, it would be easy for other nations to retaliate with similar discriminations and thereby largely negative such a policy."

Finally then, Honorable Judges, after considering every phase of this question which is now before us, what should be our attitude toward government ownership as a method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States? As progressive American citizens we must regard it as a forward step in the economic achievements characteristic of twentieth century efficiency. The

government now expends the money of all the people in safeguarding the traffic of the sea. The government builds lighthouses, anchors buoys, and maintains life saving stations. In the light of these facts it is only just and reasonable that the governmental treasury, as a depository for the people's funds, should receive the money arising from ocean transportation rates and charges. While thus receiving payment for direct services rendered, the government would in turn provide improved transportation facilities, an effective means for training our seamen, and an efficient naval auxiliary. Furthermore it is a governmental duty to buildup and operate a merchant marine in order to afford world markets for every product of every form of American labor, since private enterprise has failed to meet the need. In addition to this we find that government ownership is, in itself, the most desirable method for building up and operating our merchant marine because it is economically beneficial, it is the only method whereby an adequate merchant marine will ever be built up, and because it is practical and efficient. For these reasons we of the affirmative maintain that government ownership is the best method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, FRED S. FIELD, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the opposition have seen fit to propound several questions which they say cannot be an-

swered. I shall take up these queries and attempt to show the contrary.

1. Where is the precedent for government ownership?

We have already presented two precedents. The first being the government owned and operated Panama line and the second being the case of the Russian Government.

2. Where is the demand for government ownership?

We have on the table Senate Doc. 673 which points out clearly the demand for government ownership. This document is composed of hundreds of letters from shipping concerns all over the United States. These letters all show the inefficiency of private ownership and the exorbitant rates charged by these companies and almost without exception advocate some form of government ownership. The Southern Commercial Congress in their recent pamphlet heartily advocated government ownership and operation and in so doing placed the entire Gulf Coast in line with this demand. Also, there have been about fifteen bills introduced into Congress providing for government ownership and not one bill advocating any other method. These instances certainly show that there is a demand for government ownership.

3. How will the merchant marine be operated?

As far as we can see the same as any other merchant marine. The mere fact that the government owns the ships need not make any difference in the method of operation.

4. How do you intend to get the ships?

We stand for the same method advocated in every one of the bills presented on this subject. Let the govern-

ment build the ships thus providing work and employment for hundreds of men in this country.

5. Wherein lies the need of a government owned and operated marine?

The need is very evident. For many years private capital has had a chance to build up a merchant marine and has failed. At the present time over ninety-eight per cent. of the foreign trade of the United States is carried in foreign ships. This clearly shows that we have no adequate merchant marine. This fact coupled with the demand for government ownership clearly shows the need.

Honorable Judges, we admit that we have been taken by surprise. We thought that our opponents would advocate any alternative but the one they have advocated. They say that the only thing that needs to be done to build up the merchant marine of the United States is to repeal the present navigation laws. However, they have neglected to show us exactly what are the faults of the present navigation laws.

The last report of the Commissioner of Navigation points out that the present navigation laws are no stricter than the laws of other nations. He says, "The requirement of American ownership is no real restriction for all other nations have the same requirement. The next point in the navigation laws, that all watch officers must be citizens of the United States, is not unjust. Other nations have the same requirement." The commissioner further shows that there is no restriction on the nation-

ality of the crews in the American navigation laws. The other clauses in the navigation laws deal with the rate of wages, the requirement of safety devices, and the comfort of the seamen. Now what the negative wishes to do is to let down the bars and abolish all these requirements. They want to lower the standard of American seamen. Briefly their case may be summed up as follows: The present standard of American seamen is too high. Let us reduce their wages, take away the safety devices, let American ships be owned by foreigners, and the merchant marine will build itself up.

Ladies and gentlemen, such a method is absurd. What the American merchant marine needs is the application of some constructive principle. Our opponents have advocated a course that has not been seriously considered by students of this subject. Their plan is the reduction of the American standard of living. The plan advocated by the affirmative is constructive; it is a plan that will give us a much needed foreign marine; and, it raises instead of lowers the American standard of living.

We of the affirmative have presented our case. We have advocated a plan that will relieve the present situation. We have replied to our opponents' questions and showed precedent, demand, method of operation, method of obtaining ships, and the need of a government owned marine. Lastly, we have taken up the negative alternative and shown that it has no reasonable foundation.

Upon viewing this proposition from all its angles what do we find? We learn that private capital with an unquestioned occupancy of the field has failed to build up

an adequate merchant marine, we see that all other methods except government ownership are inapplicable and inadequate, that all methods dependent on private capital and subject to the abuses of private ownership have never developed the vast commercial power of the United States. We see this great country commercially crippled for the lack of ships that private capital can never supply. The American people are not content to stand aside and see American commerce carried in foreign ships. They see the great possibilities of government ownership and operation. They are demanding the adoption of such a policy because it does not possess the defects of other methods, because it is essentially a governmental function, because a government owned and operated marine would provide a much needed naval auxiliary, because it would be an economic benefit to the whole nation, because it is the only method by which an American merchant marine will ever be built up, because it would be practical, efficient, and economical—and for these reasons is the best method of building up and operating the merchant marine of the United States, for turning the great public utility of the sea into the hands of the people, to be operated by the people, for the benefit of American citizens.

FIRST NEGATIVE, WILLIAM GEISTWEIT, UNIVERSITY OF
REDLANDS, '15

Ladies and Gentlemen: The question for discussion to-night does not deal with the merits or demerits of government ownership in general. Nor are we discuss-

ing government ownership and operation of railroads and telephone lines. The question is whether or not government ownership would be the best way of building up and operating an American merchant marine. Our first contention is that government owned and operated merchant marine must stand on its own individual and peculiar merits. The affirmative case then, since they must furnish us the burden of proof, must stand or fall upon considerations of precedent, necessity, popular demand, expediency, and practicability. And further the affirmative must show a government owned and operated merchant marine to be superior to any other plan.

The negative will content itself this evening with raising questions which will force the affirmative to meet these considerations. We maintain that our government should not take such a far-reaching, significant, undemocratic, and reactionary-revolutionary step as to enter the shipping business in official competition with existing merchant marines unless any and all objections can be answered conclusively and incontrovertibly.

Question number one, gentlemen, is: Have you any precedent for a government owned merchant marine? The only one that we can find is the one owned and operated by the government of West Australia. Concerning this line the Attorney General of that province reports that for its two years of operation this line incurred a loss of \$210,000. The London *Spectator* for January 30, 1915, says that West Australia purchased one ship, the S. S. *Stuart* and refitted it for £16,300, and after two years sold it for £6,200, a loss of £10,100.

Subtracting from this £2,381, the amount the ship earned in the two years, there is still a net loss of £7,719. The S. S. *Australia* cost them \$73,000, and at the end of two years was offered for sale at \$45,000 and found no buyer. From this it is clear, Honorable Judges, that precedent teaches the utter and absolute failure of the affirmative's proposed action. Now, gentlemen of the affirmative, this brings you face to face with a fundamental issue in this debate—Do you propose that the government operate its merchant marine at a profit or a loss? We insist upon an answer to this question.

Now, Honorable Judges, since no successful maritime nations own their own merchant marines, and since West Australia has made a failure of it, what are the reasons for our country attempting such a revolutionary experiment? Gentlemen of the affirmative, this is question number two, Why? First, you say, we have no merchant marine to speak of under private ownership. Still, we have carried on a constantly increasing trade with Europe and have gotten along very well without one. Second, perhaps the reason is that we want the flag in every port. That appeals to our patriotism, and, as Jacob Riis found out, it may cure the homesickness of some of "Cook's chickens." But, ladies and gentlemen, this is the spread eagle argument of the Fourth of July orator of Pumpkinville Center. We must have something more fundamental. Well, we need naval auxiliaries in time of war. Honorable Judges, we wish to point out that England, France, and Germany have plenty of them in the present war and they did not own their merchant marines.

Would it not be wise to study their methods before investing the government's money? Again, it is said that a government owned merchant marine will furnish experienced seamen for the navy in time of war. But the difficulty is that these men would not be trained. It is common knowledge that the seamen on Germany's auxiliaries are not the men who sailed them in time of peace. Would it not be better to train the men in the navy as we are doing now? Now, it is urged further that we want a merchant marine to build up our foreign commerce. According to the Boston Maritime Association, "the history of trade development clearly indicates that trade (especially with South America) may not be expected to follow mere transportation opportunities." Senator Burton in a speech in the United States Senate, Jan. 7, 1915, furnished statistics to show that vessels sailing between New York and South American ports have plenty of empty cargo space. Evidently something more than a merchant marine is needed to build up our commerce in South America. Would the affirmative advocate that the government go into the trading business in order to have a full cargo as a private corporation might do? Of course it is as reasonable for the government to go into the trading business as it is the shipping business but, Honorable Judges, where would this natural desire to make the merchant marine pay lead us? Where would this policy end? Last, there is the reason furnished by the desire to lower shipping rates. Before the present war, with its accompanying normal and legitimate rise of freight charges, there existed no cry for lower rates. Now, the

present, emergency conditions which have forced up the normal rates are used as an argument for a government owned merchant marine. We contend that it is not the lack of ships that have boosted rates, but high insurance due to the war risk, delay in unloading due to lack of labor at foreign ports because the men have gone to war, and because military business takes precedence, and lack of a return cargo to pay part of the expense due to the fact that Europe is not exporting. If our government had a merchant marine now and under these conditions attempted to lower rates, it would undoubtedly be forced to operate at a loss. With these six reasons before us, Honorable Judges, shall we say that they are conclusive and incontrovertible enough to justify the government in spending countless millions in this experiment?

Now, let us turn from the reasons for a merchant marine to question number three: Why do we not have a merchant marine now under private ownership? At one time we had an excellent merchant marine — why did we lose it? For the simple reason that we abandoned our policy of protection under which we had gained our marine. Reciprocity agreements were entered into with England and our marine promptly began to decline. Then came the Civil War and our ships were driven from the sea by privateers. Our shipping has never recovered because our government has been wilfully blind to the reasons for the success of foreign merchant marines and has obstinately refused to foster, aid, or protect American shipping in any way. Furthermore, our shipping legislation has been actually hostile to the building up of an

American marine. In the first place our navigation laws are based on shore conditions. This means unreasonably high wages and consequent inability to compete with foreign marines successfully. Second, we have had unfavorable admeasurement laws. Mr. Robert Dollar, president of one of our foremost shipping concerns, testified before a Congressional committee that the difference between British and American ratings meant as much as \$5,500 a year on one small ship of about three thousand tons. Again, our government has interfered needlessly with the construction and installation of machinery. Until the present war broke out our laws required that a ship be owned by American capital, be built by American labor in an American ship yard before it could enter the American merchant marine. Now, since a ship could be built in England out of American material cheaper than it could be built here, this requirement was suicidal. This explains why the great J. Pierpont Morgan made a failure of his American shipping trust, and why American capital has been driven to invest in foreign shipping or stay out of the business. And, finally, the government added insult to injury in requiring American ships to pay Panama Canal tolls. Without discussing the merits of Panama Canal tolls the fact that we allowed England to get the best of us shows a woeful lack of regard for the interests of an American merchant marine. And now, Honorable Judges, with the European War on and the conditions ripe for the building up of an American merchant marine in private hands, instead of making our laws favorable or fostering such a movement in any way,

the proposition is for the government to step in, seize this business, and forever close the doors to private enterprise. Honorable Judges, is this right, is such action defensible? Is it fair for any one to assume that private enterprise in America can't handle this business, and that therefore the government must do it, when private enterprise has not been given a square deal?

Now, Gentlemen of the opposition, question number four: How do you propose to get this government owned merchant marine? Are you going to buy ships or build them? Suppose the government builds. That will take at least two years, and will give no relief for present conditions. If we must wait government ownership presents no advantage over private ownership, for private interests have already flooded our ship yards with orders. Suppose then the government attempts to buy. From whom shall she buy? From Germany and Austria? Shall she take the interned ships and violate our neutrality? Obviously this is out of the question. Who else has ships for sale? Will any other foreign country be foolish enough to reduce its marine to build up a dangerous rival in Uncle Sam? America is left; can we buy ships at home? Owing to our past attitude toward a merchant marine, there are practically none built or for sale that the government would want. There is then nothing to be gained in time by government ownership and no plausible plan for getting ships that isn't open to private enterprise.

Now, question number five: If the government could get ships, is the move necessary? We are successfully

carrying on the greatest foreign commerce of our history at the present time. Apparently somebody is furnishing enough ships. Now, Honorable Judges, the essential thing is that our trade go on, not who carries it. If there were any dearth of ships it would certainly show now in war time, but our exports to Europe have actually increased since the war began. Where then is the trade necessity? Does it lie in South American or Oriental trade? We have plenty of lines running to these countries and as we have already shown, ships going to South America have empty cargo space. It takes more than a merchant marine to build up our trade with these countries.

Question number six: Aside from trade demands which we have shown to be non-existent, is there a demand upon the part of the people for such a move? In the recent excitement over government ownership of the merchant marine it seemed "that all with one accord began to make excuses." Even a temporary measure raised up a storm of protest all over the country. The people are not asking for it. Even the shippers haven't urged a government merchant marine. In fact they have distinctly discouraged the movement.

Question number seven: If it were possible, if it were necessary, if there were a popular demand, is a government merchant marine expedient? The negative maintains that it is not because it is fraught with danger. Suppose the United States had a merchant marine now. Suppose one of our vessels started to Germany with a cargo of wheat. We would have a right to do this as

wheat is not contraband and there is no official blockade. But, bang! An English warship commands a United States Government vessel to halt, submit to search, and perhaps be sunk as was the case with the *William P. Frye*, whose fate the German representative declared legal regardless of flag, cargo, etc. Would the people of the United States stand for this? If it were a private owned ship it would mean merely a claim for damages, as in the case of the *Frye*, but being a government ship — what? Senator H. C. Lodge sees danger ahead. Senator Jones of Washington says, "I believe it means war." If the ship were not sunk, our government would of necessity appear as defendant in a prize court. Would it not be better to leave this sort of thing to a private corporation?

Suppose again a government vessel was carrying some of this powder and ammunition that we have been selling to England. Can a government do this and remain neutral? According to international law a private owned ship can. Germany would undoubtedly resent such action on the part of our government merchant marine and suppose a submarine sunk one of our ships — then what? But the affirmative may say the government will not carry contraband. How can it help itself as long as the American people have a clear right to ship it? It must carry the goods offered.

Now whether or not we carried contraband, "A merchant fleet sailing under government control carrying cargoes to the warring nations would be a sure invitation to foreign distrust and sooner or later would involve the menace of war." (*Outlook*, Feb. 24, 1915.) Moreover,

an official attempt to steal South American trade from Europe will inevitably lead us to armed unfriendliness with the maritime nations of Europe. Thus a government merchant marine becomes a motive for war, and through its auxiliaries a means of war, and is a dangerous and inexpedient possession.

Ladies and Gentlemen, here are the questions. We demand from the affirmative a conclusive and incontrovertible answer. When they get through with these questions my colleague has some more to ask them.

SECOND NEGATIVE, SAMUEL KNIGHT, UNIVERSITY OF
REDLANDS, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the first place permit me to review briefly the negative arguments. We are not debating to-night, the government ownership of telegraphs or railroads but the government ownership of the American merchant marine solely, and we maintain that the debate must be on the merits of this particular question. We maintain that there is no precedent for a government owned merchant marine except in West Australia where in two years of operation the system which the affirmative are proposing fell behind over \$200,000. Again we have pointed out that no successful maritime nations own their merchant marines. The decline of our merchant marine we have shown to be due to hostile congressional legislation. We have shown that there is no satisfactory method of building up a government owned merchant marine, and that, if one could be built up, it would surely,

in such a combat as is now raging, involve the United States in war.

Let us now look at the practical side of this proposition. The great question in the modern order of things is, "Will it work?" We do not care what a thing may be in these days; it is all right if it will work. That is our test. A man who will not work is not wanted; a machine that will not work is discarded; a theory that will not work is forgotten; and now we ask the question concerning a government owned merchant marine,—will it work? In the experience of Australia it was not practical and there is no other example or precedent except the one in Russia mentioned by the affirmative. As a matter of fact there is none in Russia. They have only one river line, operating inland, and this is not in any sense a national merchant marine such as we are discussing to-night. Now, if the Australians with all their experience in government ownership and reform legislation could not make a success of a government owned and operated merchant marine how can we without such experience hope to succeed. As the old saw has it, it is a foolish man who will learn only by his own experience.

Our opponents have urged this evening that the ownership and operation of a merchant marine is a governmental function, in fact a government prerogative or duty. We cannot concede this. The province of government ownership lies in natural public service monopolies. The merchant marine is not, never has been, and never will be such a monopoly. Time and again attempts have been made to monopolize the maritime trade and they have al-

ways resulted in failure. The great trust organized a few years ago to control the shipping of the Atlantic was soon forced into the hands of the receiver. The Pacific Mail tried to get control of the shipping on the Pacific and soon went to the wall. This company has never again made the attempt. At one time the trade of the Pacific Coast was practically organized into a monopoly, but immediately other vessels came and now there are several lines in the traffic operating vessels of the first class. This is true because of the very nature of a ship. Their routes are not fixed; they pick up cargoes anywhere destined for anywhere. When one vessel begins to organize a good carrying trade another vessel appears in port looking for business and competition is at once established.

Again, because of the very nature of a ship, the merchant marine does not lend itself to a uniform system of control such as is necessary in all government undertakings. There are a great many practical questions involved in this subject, for instance, where to and where from would the government owned ships run? Obviously they could not run from all ports. Yet, they would have to do so for, according to the Constitution of the United States, Article one, Section nine, the government covenants to treat the commerce of all States alike. It would be impossible to own a merchant marine and treat the commerce of all States alike. We find that private ships favor certain ports because they have certain local advantages. These local conditions would render it utterly impossible for the government to avoid discrimination and inequality in its shipping service. Some ports

would necessarily have to be favored, despite the fact that the Constitution would be violated, and the ports which would be favored would naturally be the ones which could exert the greatest pressure on Congress. Wharves and steamship lines would be given to ports which had influence, in some cases despite unfavorable local conditions. We should probably have the same state of affairs we have had in our rivers and harbor appropriations (pork barrel, I should say) and the same state of affairs we have now in our navy yards. Why, we actually have a navy yard that is equipped to build dreadnaughts that require thirty-five feet of water to float in, and the depth of water at this navy yard is precisely seventeen feet! A fine example, isn't it, of that government efficiency and superiority over private enterprise that our opponents have been talking about?

Now again, facing the question practically, where is the government going to get ships? Will it buy foreign vessels with which to run private lines off the high seas? If so, where will it get foreign ships? Or, will the government buy all the privately owned American ships? This would merely transfer the ownership, not build up the merchant marine. There are about five thousand American owned vessels. Two thousand three hundred and sixty are engaged in foreign trade. These are worth about six hundred million dollars. The rest of the marine is made up of coasting vessels, coal carriers, tank ships, ore vessels, grain ships, sailing vessels, etc., and these are worth five or six hundred million. Our merchant marine is not so small then as our opponents

would have you believe. It now stands second in the world. It was third until England swept German commerce from the seas. If the German submarines keep on shooting straight we may soon be first. Now, it would take an enormous amount of money to buy these ships and where is the money to come from?

Of course our opponents will say, let the government build ships. If this is decided upon it will cost just as much and probably more than to buy those we now have afloat. There is no escaping the initial expense. Moreover, when the government has the ships the cost is by no means disposed of. The ships are the least item in the assets and expenses of a ship company. After having obtained the ships the next thing is to know where they are going to land. The government will have to use the wharves that are now owned by private concerns, cities, and state governments. In the case of the first the government would have to pay for the service and in so doing she would not only pay for the upkeep of those wharves and the interest on the investment, but would also pay a profit into the pockets of the owners of those wharves. To eliminate this profit it will be necessary to buy the wharves and they are worth countless millions. The water front of San Francisco is worth two hundred and fifty million dollars, that of New York is worth one and a half billion, that of Philadelphia, seven hundred and fifty million, that of Boston, a half billion, and the wharves of other ports stand in proportion. In fact, the wharves in American sea ports are worth close to fifteen billion dollars and the

government will have to buy these wharves or else pay dividends on their valuation.

A startling complication lies in the fact that many of these private owned wharves are in the hands of foreign capital and foreign steamship companies. Now we leave it to you, Honorable Judges, is it practical common sense to pay dividends to your rivals and competitors for the privilege of competing for business? Now we cannot condemn and seize this foreign owned property for the purpose of building up a merchant marine and taking their trade from them, hence we must endure international competition and pay our wharf rates.

Now, not only are the wharves necessary, but it takes many miles of railroad track to operate the wharves. There must be spur tracks and connections in all harbors. If the government seized any vacant harbor land where that is possible to escape its tribute to private companies, it would be forced to deal with the railroads which are in league with the private steamship companies. The Santa Fé owns more than a hundred miles of track in the China Basin at San Francisco and in all other ports there are parallel railroad conditions. These tracks cost from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars a mile and to get control of the feeding lines necessary the government would have to pay out another five billion dollars. If she does not buy she will have to pay for the use of them and thus will put profit into the pockets of the owners.

. But this is not all. There are many ship yards scattered through the country. These are valued at seven

billion dollars. If the government pays the private owners of these yards for new ships she will again have to pay dividends on an enormous amount of money. The only escape is to buy the yards, or to build new yards which would delay things and cost as much or more in the end. To own and operate a real merchant marine, then, the government will have to pay interest on approximately thirty billion dollars. Unless she buys much of the necessary property she will have to pay dividends to private capital in addition. There is no escape. No one can say, then, that financially, in the face of these facts, this is a practical proposition.

And this is not all. Our opponents have not told us whether the government is going to run the ships at a profit or a loss. Now since we cannot forbid our ports to foreign or private vessels, it is evident that the government will have competition. Competition against foreign capital and foreign labor, with its low standard, means that it is out of the question to run the government ships at a profit. This is obvious to any one conversant with the situation. By running at a loss the government will gradually stifle all American shipping and drive the flag off the sea as far as private enterprise is concerned. So, then, instead of building up our merchant marine, government ownership will destroy what we now have and bring on a fight with foreign competitors. By destroying the American marine she does not by any means drive the American shipowner out of the business. He will merely invest in foreign ships; thus our capital is estranged.

Now, further, if the government runs its ships at a loss to compete with the foreigner or to drive out private companies, it will have to do so at tremendous sacrifice considering the difference in labor, and some one will have to pay the loss. The government will of course pay, but who is the government? Manifestly the people will have to pay through taxation and the very people who had their private lines of shipping destroyed will have to pay. What shall we gain by all this? The foreigners will still keep on competing with us since they are by treaty given the right to use our ports on the same terms as our own vessels. We shall have an annual loss of tremendous proportions and public sentiment will force the abandonment of the enterprise since we regard treaties as something more than mere scraps of paper and cannot abrogate them. We are then face to face with failure or international disputes and entanglements.

Our opponents cannot deny these facts. The very reason they advocate government ownership in building up the merchant marine is because foreign competition and cheap labor hold American enterprise down. The very fact that we have ships at all is a remarkable tribute to Yankee enterprise and efficiency. Now if the foreign competition is too keen for American ships at the present time, how can we expect the government to do any better? We don't. We expect the government to pay. Add, then, to the interest on the initial investment, a gigantic annual deficit. Is the scheme practicable?

But, Honorable Judges, this is not all. As we have shown, our navigation laws are an added handicap to American shipping. If the government would remove this handicap, we believe that the American investor would soon overcome the foreign labor handicap and build up a creditable marine. All that you have to do is to make it possible for the shipping business to pay and the seas will not be large enough to hold the American ships.

In case we can't overcome our handicap, and we maintain that government ownership is not a successful way of doing it, it will make little difference anyhow. In modern business an agent goes to Europe and sells the goods. The goods are the property of the foreigner before they are put on the boat, and naturally he has them sent to him on his own ships. It does not concern us greatly what ship carries the goods; the important thing is that they buy the goods of us. If we can't have a merchant marine without taxing the American people for its support, suppose we do. without one while private capital shifts for itself.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES

Consular Report of the American Diplomatic Service. Vol. 58.
Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1909.
The President's Message of December 8, 1914.
The Outlook. 108:120-121. Sept. 16, 1914.
The Outlook. 108:198-208. Sept. 9, 1914.

The Nation. 99: Sept. 10, 1914.

The Forum. 49:377-456.

The Century. 88:339-348. July, 1914.

Senate Document No. 601. An article prepared by the Southern Commercial Congress on the proposed establishment of an American merchant marine.

Senate Document No. 225. Presented by Mr. Gallinger on "Development of the American Ocean Mail Service and American Commerce."

Speech of the Hon. Jacob H. Gallinger of New Hampshire in the United States Senate, August 14 and 17, 1914.

Speech of the Hon. Samuel W. Beakes of Michigan in the House of Representatives, August 3, 1914.

Speech of the Hon. James W. Bryan of Washington in the House of Representatives, March 31, 1914.

Address delivered by the Hon. William G. McAdoo before the Commercial Club, at Chicago, on Jan. 9, 1915.

House Report No. 1149, by Mr. Alexander, Chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Report of the Hearing before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. August 28, 1914.

Senate Document No. 673. On Increased Transportation Rates. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce.

The Congressional Record. Vol. 152, No. 34. January 19, 1915.

Senate Document No. 6856.

House Documents Nos. 18,666, 18,336, 18,338, 18,313, 18,312, 18,204.

THE NEGATIVE REFERENCES

The negative used the bibliography compiled by the Librarian of Congress.

In addition to the documents given above the negative used the *Congressional Record* from Dec. 1914, to May, 1915, as the government ownership issue was debated in Congress at this session and the speeches are scattered throughout the *Record*.

Letters from the Chambers of Commerce in all the important cities of the United States were collected.

SHIP SUBSIDY

SHIP SUBSIDY

HILLSDALE COLLEGE vs. HOPE and KALAMAZOO COLLEGES

In the first annual contests of the Hillsdale-Hope-Kalamazoo Triangular Debating League, held April 19, 1915, the affirmative team of each institution was victorious. The Hillsdale affirmative team won from the Hope Negative at Hillsdale 3 to 0; the Kalamazoo affirmative won from the Hillsdale negative at Kalamazoo 2 to 1; and the Hope affirmative won from the Kalamazoo negative at Holland, Michigan, 3 to 0.

The subject discussed was one of peculiar interest at the time of the debate because of the agitation over government ownership of the merchant marine, and with the debate which immediately precedes in this volume brings the discussion of what to do for our merchant marine rather thoroughly before the reader.

The statement of the subject as the Michigan colleges debated it follows:

Resolved, that the United States should subsidize its merchant marine.

The Hillsdale speeches were contributed to "Intercollegiate Debates" by Mr. Gordon L. Cave, of the English department of Hillsdale College, in charge of debating at that institution.

SHIP SUBSIDY

HILLSDALE COLLEGE vs. HOPE COLLEGE

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, RALPH C. ROSENCRANCE,
HILLSDALE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Sixty-third Congress has just closed with the greatest filibuster in American history. And why? Since the Civil War, the American merchant marine has shrunk to proportions such that the American flag is seldom seen in foreign seaports. The European war has emphasized the evils of a small merchant marine. To remedy this condition, the administrative forces advocated the Alexander bill, involving temporary government ownership of merchant vessels. A coalition of subsidy advocates and those who prefer present conditions have just filibustered the bill to death in the closing days of the session.

We shall prove that the United States needs a larger marine. As a method of securing a merchant marine we propose direct subsidies. The term, "subsidize," is a very broad term involving all government aid to private industry without equal return to the government. Subsidies may be direct or indirect. The Alexander bill involved indirect subsidy, because it provided for

temporary government ownership. After the initial risks were over, the plan provided for selling to private industry. The Alexander bill would be indirect subsidy to private industry unless the government made both ends meet on its investment. The policy of discriminating duties to which the present tariff has already committed us and which is now before the Supreme Court for a test of constitutionality is also a method of indirect subsidy. We shall not advocate one of these means however. Our second speaker will show that our method of direct government aid to private industry will meet the needs, while the third speaker will show that ship subsidy is practicable from political and economic standpoints.

Does the United States need a strong fleet of merchant vessels flying the American flag? We answer, "Yes." The negative may answer, "Yes" or "No."

If they answer "No," it devolves upon us to show that a strong merchant marine is needed. If they answer "Yes," they accept the burden of showing a constructive remedy for present conditions—a remedy that does not involve government aid to private industry without tangible compensation. Because of the fact, then, that the negative may deny the statement that the United States needs a strong merchant marine, I shall demonstrate an urgent naval need, a permanent commercial need, and an emergency need for a strong commercial fleet.

We need a strong merchant marine for naval purposes because an efficient navy is essential to preserva-

tion of our rights as neutrals in any war, to national defense, to successful maintenance of our foreign policies, and a strong merchant marine is an indispensable supplement to an efficient navy.

The United States adds each day to its responsibilities. Our duty to educate Filipinos and Hawaiians so they may finally enjoy the blessings of democracy; to conserve the immense resources of Alaska for our posterity; our obligation under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to keep the Panama Canal "free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations under terms of entire equality"; our duty assumed in the Monroe Doctrine to guard the republic from attacks by other nations; our duty as a signatory power to the Open Door Policy of China to guard the newest republic against the threatened Japanese aggression; our duties to American and foreign citizens entrusted to our care in Mexico; the safeguarding of our rights as neutrals, endangered as they have been by the war zone decrees (recently so brazenly violated in the sinking of the *William Frye* by the irresponsible German captain of the *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*), all of these duties emphasize the imminence of war and the consequent need of an efficient navy.

The General Naval Board in its 1914 report concludes that our navy is inefficient in many respects, one of which is in auxiliaries which can be used for scouts, colliers, tenders, and transports. To quote from the late Senator Frye: "Our brief decisive war with Spain compelled us to hunt the seas for transports and colliers, to purchase or charter forty ships from foreign nations."

All because we had no strong merchant marine. In 1908, the peaceful voyage of the United States fleet around the world was made possible only by chartering foreign vessels. In case of a *real* war, it would be harder to charter foreign ships from neutral nations.

In spite of the fact that foreign merchant vessels were used in the Spanish war and in the peaceful trip around the world, the negative may assert that merchant ships are not suited for naval uses. Yet the Chicago *Record Herald* for last Saturday reports the sinking by a German submarine of the *Bavano*, a British merchant vessel which was doing efficient scout service for the British navy. We do not say, however, that merchant vessels are any less vulnerable to torpedo attack than warships. But we do claim that they are valuable auxiliaries for scouts, transports, tenders, etc.

Moreover, a strong merchant marine trains valuable naval reserves. The Naval Board says, "We need more than 18,000 additional naval reserves." Without the auxiliaries and naval reserves, which would be available from a healthy merchant marine, our navy can be counted as only a useless mass of steel whose existence leads to a false sense of security.

In addition to the naval need for a merchant marine because of probability of war and the additional efficiency possible by use of merchant vessels as auxiliaries and men as naval reserves, there is a permanent commercial need for a strong merchant marine. The need for a strong merchant marine is especially felt in the South American and Occidental trade. The day has

come when we must seek our living in the markets of the world. As long as the frontier existed, as an outlet for surplus population, we used foreign markets simply as an outlet for over-production. In normal times our manufacturers found a ready market for their products with the miners, herders, and farmers of the frontier. To-day the frontier is gone, our population is greater, and our manufacturers are able to supply foreign markets—in fact, they must sell goods in foreign markets if the country is to be blessed with that degree of prosperity that has been ours during the exploitation of the frontier.

Moreover, Americans are prepared to buy raw materials from South America. Our farmers need the Chile-nitrates for fertilizers; the millions in our cities oppressed by the high cost of living are demanding Argentine beef. Chemists tell us that Bolivian tin is destined to displace the Malaysian product, and the failure to make synthetic rubber a commercial success must make us dependent on Peru for this indispensable commodity; that further, if the European war is continued, we shall be compelled to return to natural dyestuffs. Still many other commodities may be added to these.

We are keenly alive to the needs for export markets and for raw materials. This is shown by the passing of a provision in the National Reserve Act giving our banks the power to establish branches in foreign countries. The National City Bank of New York has already established branches at Buenos Aires, Montevideo, and Rio de Janeiro under its provisions. These

and further credit facilities, the lack of which stood in the way of South American commerce have been provided.

Moreover, the American merchant is at last wide awake to the demands of the South American trade. He is demanding that the college train his young men to speak Spanish. He is seriously studying the customs and wants of these people and is training salesmen who will accommodate their demands.

Finally, the government has taken steps to win over the suspicious South American. Better consular legislation, the establishment of the Pan-American Union, the acceptance of the A. B. C. mediation, the Mobile declaration of President Wilson in which he committed the United States not to seek territorial expansion in this hemisphere, the adoption thereby of a looser interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the repeal of the Panama Canal Tolls Legislation, the new treaty with Colombia paying for the alleged theft of Panama, the successful negotiation of peace treaties with eleven South American countries—all these are ushering in an era of good feeling that augurs well the future success of the American merchant.

And here we have the difficulty that ship subsidy will remedy. According to the American Year Book for 1913, ten per cent. of our commerce was carried under the American flag. At the present time this percentage is probably greater, due to the fact that approximately 130 foreign vessels have entered our registry since last August. But even admitting this, service to South

America is entirely inadequate. The consular reports are full of statements to this effect. Chargé d'Affaires Lorillard at Buenos Aires writes under date of September 15, 1914, "Without more rapid and regular means of transportation permanent control of this market is impossible." A great deal of our mail reaches South America by way of Europe and the same is true of our manufactured goods. Until the war, European conferences have determined rates and even discriminated against American goods. Ladies and gentlemen, there is a permanent need for more regular lines to South America. Foreigners have not furnished them. We must provide them ourselves.

In addition to an urgent naval need and a permanent commercial need for a merchant marine, the past six months serve as a monumental lesson in the folly of dependence upon foreigners for transportation facilities. The internment of ships of belligerents in neutral ports, the commandeering of ships by belligerents, the sinking and capture of ships, the congestion in war zone ports, the delays incident upon securing return cargoes and supplies—all these causes have operated to produce a scarcity of ships which has resulted in high rates and consequently a restriction in markets. According to a joint letter sent by Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of Commerce to the Senate, January 25th, on four representative rates to Liverpool, rates increased from July 1, 1914, to January 1, 1915, on grain three hundred per cent., on flour three hundred per cent., on cotton four hundred per cent., and on meat and lard

fifty per cent. We might go on indefinitely quoting statistics showing abnormal increase in rates. Such rates are subject to the economic law of supply and demand. The supply was lessened by war conditions. The demand was not restricted as much. Rates went up. If we had possessed a strong merchant marine, commandeering, sinking by belligerents, and internment would not have hurt us. We would have been independent of foreigners and rates would not have risen so abnormally.

Ladies and gentlemen, I contend that a naval, commercial, and emergency need exists for a strong American merchant marine. Gentlemen of the negative, do you admit these needs or do you deny them?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, CARLETON B. MILLER,
HILLSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker of the negative has confined his attention to the present shipping emergency, which he says would not have been mitigated by the existence of a strong American merchant marine. He further argues what is very potent, that the adoption of a ship subsidy policy cannot remedy the present emergency. We frankly admit that our policy of ship subsidy can do little for the present emergency. We have no Aladdin's lamp with which to conjure up a full-fledged American fleet, but we do contend that the existence of a vigorous American merchant fleet at the outbreak of the European war would have helped the cotton grower of the

South. When hostilities began, we had a right to trade with Germany in non-contraband. Cotton is non-contraband. We had a big crop. We could have sold it in Germany before the British war zone became effective, November 5th. This also applies to other commodities. With such a fleet and international law on our side, we could have prevented that war decree. We must have a merchant marine, as an insurance against such losses in the future. Thus far, the negative has paid no attention to the argument that we need a merchant marine as a naval aid and to meet permanent commercial needs. The United States has no merchant marine. She needs one. We propose ship subsidy as a remedy.

The two underlying reasons why the United States has no merchant marine are: first, greater cost of construction; and, second, greater cost of operation. These causes must be removed before the great need which the affirmative has shown to exist can be met. I shall show that such causes exist and then outline the remedy wherein the affirmative propose to remove the causes which handicap the American investor in the shipping business, and thereby restore the United States merchant marine on an adequate scale.

Professor E. R. Johnson of the University of Pennsylvania, leading authority on ocean transportation, says, in his work "Ocean and Inland Water Transportation," "Previous estimates have placed the cost of the American built ship from fifteen per cent. to twenty-five per cent. above the cost of the foreign built vessel. While the exact difference cannot be estimated, all witnesses

are agreed that the American costs are higher. Under present conditions the foreign builder has the advantage fully twenty per cent. or twenty-five per cent. The difference in cost is quite enough to enable the foreigner to underbid successfully our ship builders, and the result is that an American ship company usually orders the ships built abroad and then operates them under some foreign flag." But a greater cost in construction is a small part of the handicap which the American has to meet. Not only must he pay more to build than his foreign competitor, but he must pay more to operate as well. For example, let us take two ships of the same capacity and character, running side by side in the same competitive trade from New York to the West Indies, one American and the other British. The American vessel must carry a crew of thirty-two men to twenty-seven on a British ship. The master of the American vessel is paid \$175 a month as compared to the \$100 salary of the British master. The American chief engineer gets \$150 a month; the British, \$98, and so on in proportion. The entire wages of the crew, which are only from eight per cent. to eighteen per cent. of the total operating expenses, amount to \$1,655 a month on the American ship and \$995 on the British ship. The American ship is handicapped by wages alone to the amount of \$660 a month. I take these figures from the Congressional Record of February 1, 1915, page 3089.

E. R. Johnson states on page 317 of his work quoted above, "The higher costs of operating vessels under the

American flag present the most difficult of all the problems to be solved in making possible the growth of our merchant marine. The higher standards of living, and the higher wages prevailing in the United States, keep the operating costs higher for America than for foreign ships." According to both the New York Chamber of Commerce and the Merchant Marine Commission, the difference in cost of operation is between five per cent. and ten per cent. on freight steamers and ten per cent. on passenger vessels.

Ladies and gentlemen, in order to have a merchant marine, these causes which prevent it must be removed. The plan by which we propose to subsidize our ships directly and thus to restore them permanently is not one that we have evolved out of our own wisdom or lack of wisdom. It is drawn from that adopted by the New York Chamber of Commerce by a vote of 290 to 4 after a debate lasting from January 7 to January 28, 1915. The plan proposes: first, to equalize the difference in cost of construction and operation through government aid; second, to guarantee ship mortgages; and third, to create a shipping board with powers to foster the shipping business,

In regard to the first part, we propose to have the government enter into contracts with ship builders for a period of ten years, during which time the government will pay the difference in cost of construction. Ten years is the time limit set because ample time is given to arrange for the construction of a large tonnage and for American ability and ingenuity to overcome

present inequalities. To contract further, that for a period of twenty years, the government will pay the difference in cost of operation between American and European standards. Twenty years is the time limit, for it assures private capital of equitable operating conditions during the life of vessels constructed under government contract. By the end of that time, the shipping business will be so standardized as to be able to take care of itself, as our next speaker will prove. All contracts would provide for the taking over of ships in time of war and subsidized ships must be owned by American citizens, or at least a majority of the capital stock.

But any plan devised to encourage the upbuilding of our merchant marine must recognize the fact that the steamship man can do nothing unless he can get the capital necessary to get ships to engage in the foreign trade, no matter what subsidies may be granted. To get money to go into the shipping business under the American flag, he must go to the American investor for that money. Now the American investor knows little about the value of steamship securities. The situation here is not as it is in England, where all are acquainted with steamship securities, their earning power, and past records. The American investor knows almost nothing about the value of ships. Hence, to get private capital to invest, a reasonable and safe security must be offered. No subsidy bill yet proposed has considered this fact. The second part of the affirmative plan proposes to offer this security by guaranteeing ship mortgages. The

method is not new or radical, but one which has been in operation for many years in another field of finance,—namely, the lending of money on real estate mortgages. Instead of spending \$30,000,000 in the actual purchase of ships, as was proposed in the Alexander bill, this \$30,000,000 would be set aside as a guarantee fund.

Take, for example, the Bond and Mortgage Company of New York. It began operating in 1892 with \$1,000,000 capital. \$750,000,000 worth of mortgages have been guaranteed, many of which have been paid off. It has outstanding \$250,000,000 of guaranteed mortgages. Its present capital is \$5,000,000 and the combined capital and surplus exceeds \$10,000,000. In a like manner, the government would guarantee for ten years bonds representing fifty per cent. of the cost to the owners of vessels approved for service desirable from the standpoint of public welfare. The total amount is not to exceed \$30,000,000 and the bonds are to run for not longer than twenty years with provision for amortization within that period. The government is to receive one-half of one per cent. annually for its guarantee, a sum which will not pay off the national debt, but it will help to defray a part of the expenses of the system. All mortgages would be a first lien upon the vessels, except for tort. Government credit to the extent of \$30,000,000 will be pledged, but on a fifty per cent. basis, vessel property to the extent of \$60,000,000 value will be produced. This guarantee measure enables the steamship man to secure money

needed during a period when the finances of the world are at great stress, to take advantage of other government inducements, and to bring shipping upon a scale which will permit equal competition.

(In the third place, we would create a shipping board to foster the shipping business. The plan of the New York Chamber of Commerce calls for a board of seven men: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Postmaster General, a naval expert, and three others appointed by the president and experienced in the ocean carrying trade as vessel operators or shippers. The Board would be placed in supreme control of shipping matters and have the following powers: to make all contracts; to determine the amount of subsidy necessary by compiling exact data in regard to the cost of construction and operation; to recommend additional legislation necessary to place us on a competitive basis with European nations and yet retain American standards of living and wages; to determine what lines of ocean-carrying trade should be developed in the interest of public welfare and the class of vessels to be constructed; to study the difference in costs between the expense of operating in various trades, both passenger and freight, under American and foreign standards, and to grant a subsidy to cover that difference in cost. The amount of subsidy in dollars and cents will be discussed by the next speaker.

The Shipping Board should be equal in dignity to the Federal Reserve Board, which is at the head of our national banking system. The value of such boards as

the Federal Reserve Board, Inter-State Commerce Commission, and National Trade Board is known to the American people. The Shipping Board is in line with what has already proved a success.)

To sum up — We have shown that a need exists; that the reasons why our merchant marine is inadequate are the greater costs of construction and operation of American vessels. We propose to restore the merchant marine by equalizing the cost of construction and operation by direct government aid, and by creating a Shipping Board to control the shipping business. This plan, if carried out vigorously, the affirmative believe will restore the United States merchant marine on an adequate scale.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, HOWARD H. HICKS, HILLSDALE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The negative have taken issue with the three needs for an American merchant marine. We ask them the question, "Could we have sold the cotton crop in Germany if we had had ships?" The economic injustice to the South, done by American neglect of shipping can never be made right. Her entire industrial system has been disturbed. Perhaps in the next crisis, the industries of Michigan will suffer. No naval need they assert! No possibility of war! The ruined homes of Belgium are witness to the folly of such a theory. There are nations to-day that are not run on principles of justice and economics. We must be prepared for the worst. The present is no time to preach disarma-

ment. No commercial need when such men as President Wilson, a thorough student of government and of economics, Secretary McAdoo, a man trained in American business methods, Secretary Redfield, chosen as Secretary of the Treasury because of his knowledge of American commercial needs, believe that there is! Go to the leading commercial bodies of the United States at New York, New Orleans, Boston, San Francisco and find us a man who believes in entrusting American shipping entirely to foreigners. And if you choose to take economic theorists as authorities, why not ask Emory R. Johnson of the University of Pennsylvania, who is America's leading authority on ocean commerce. He believes in a vigorous American merchant marine and in a ship subsidy. We demand authority for the assertion that the United States does not need a merchant marine.

The affirmative have established a naval need for an American merchant marine, a commercial need, and an emergency need. We realize that the plan employed to secure this merchant marine must be adapted to present economic and industrial conditions. We are convinced that the old form of subsidies used in Europe and even in this country were unscientific, expensive, and often-times a failure. But those old, mechanically devised subsidies were one thing; our system, scientifically planned and adapted to the needs and conditions of the times, is quite another. In form it is simple; in principle it is just; in practice it would be democratic.

The explanation of our plan made by the second

speaker shows that it is simple and direct legislation. Now with the emergency, commercial and naval need of a merchant marine before you, I direct your attention to the application of the plan. We propose in the first place to remove the management of the merchant marine from the influence of politics by placing its control in the hands of seven men, not because they are Democrats, Republicans, or Progressives, but because they are experts in their line of work. My colleague has cited the Federal Reserve Board. No one can successfully deny that its knowledge of conditions and its power to act prevented a great drain on American gold at the outbreak of the European war. The Interstate Commerce Commission has performed a similar service. Like these two commissions the marine board should be appointed by the government, paid a salary, and empowered to determine the difference in the cost of construction and operation between foreign and American ships and thus determine the amount of subsidy to be granted. As we already know approximately what that difference is, it would be impossible for the board to be dishonest without detection. But, as a further restraint, we would require that the board make a public report of all its work, thereby avoiding possibility of fraud.

While this subsidy is not subject to fraud, it will, on the other hand, promote the efficiency of our merchant marine. Instead of pensioning a private industry, we are simply paying the difference in the cost of construction and operation between foreign and American ships. This merely places the American ship owner on an equal

footing with foreigners. In order to make a profit, he must compete as he would in any other business. He must satisfy his customer by prompt delivery and good service. The manufacturer, the commission man, and the merchant all demand that kind of service (although they do not always get it). It will then be for the interest of the American ship owner to render effective service, in order to make a profit on his investment.

Free from political corruption, productive of efficiency, our subsidy will, in the third place, have an economic value. The cost of the subsidy is insignificant compared with its results. The American Merchant Marine Commission recently reported that ten million dollars under our plan will secure an adequate merchant marine. When we divide this subsidy among twenty million families, or one hundred million individuals, it will cost each family one cent per week, and each individual one-fifth of a cent per week. Small as this is, we do not propose to tax the people to aid a private industry unless the people are benefited. We are rapidly becoming a manufacturing country. As our industries grow and become more diversified, we shall be compelled to import more raw material. England and Germany will be bidding for that same raw material. It is only natural that the ships operated under the English or German flag should be partial to that country. Under such conditions the United States will get such material as England or Germany does not want. To support such a plan or advocate such a system is neither economical nor reasonable.

In the second place, the surplus output of our industries make it necessary for us to seek a foreign market. We have shown that our exports are discriminated against by slow, indirect transportation and by foreign boards of trade and foreign shipping conferences. Secretary Redfield says that goods bought and paid for two months ago are packed in foreign ships and held in foreign ports. Secretary Redfield stated one week ago last Tuesday that our trade with the Philippines was completely paralyzed because we are without a merchant marine. Consul Doty declares that our commerce with the Bahama Islands is completely cut off. Consul Dawson of Argentine states in his February report that the shipping facilities between here and South America are very poor. With the United States enjoying unlimited possibilities of commerce with South America, I ask the gentlemen to show the economy in the method we now employ. Look at the Alamo Manufacturing Company of our own city. Unable to secure ships, carload after carload of its gasoline engines, in the past few months, have been left in our ports. As a result the Alamo was compelled to close its doors for the greater part of the winter, throwing its employees out of work. When poor shipping facilities prevent the sale or delivery of a single engine, the laborers in that factory lose more than the subsidy would cost them in three years. What is true of this factory in our own city is true in thousands of other industries. Therefore, we are forced to conclude that the benefit of our subsidy to the American people will be more than its cost.

For argument's sake, however, let us suppose for a moment that the people will not get value received for their investment. Even though the negative could prove this to be the case, and that they cannot do, they have yet to show why our system should not be adopted. We have shown by the best naval authorities in the country that we need more auxiliaries for our navy. Without them our navy is weak and inadequate, even though we are appropriating one hundred and forty-six million dollars to build battleships. We propose to take ten million dollars of the naval appropriation and use it as a subsidy. The American Merchant Marine Commission reports that this would secure three hundred first class vessels that could be used as naval auxiliaries. Without extra appropriation or expenditure our plan will increase the strength of the navy and at the same time add three hundred first class ships to our merchant marine.

While our plan does not require the expenditure of a single dollar more than is already appropriated, I have proved that it is free from political corruption, that it will increase the size and efficiency of our merchant marine, and that it will benefit the people. In the fourth place, I call your attention to the fact that although our plan is necessary in order to build up a merchant marine under present conditions, that it will not be necessary to continue this subsidy for more than ten years. By that time the American merchant marine will take care of itself.

The negative cannot successfully deny that the Euro-

pean war will cause a rise in European wages. The ten leading nations of Europe are placing their most able bodied men at the front, where thousands are being killed and thousands of others are being crippled and disabled for life. At the same time property is being destroyed that will take years to replace. With an abnormal demand for labor and a scarcity of the same, wages have already risen twenty per cent. in their ship yards. The difference in American and European wages has always been one of the chief causes of our failure to build a merchant marine. But for the next twenty-five years that difference will be less than it has been in the past.

We do not claim, however, that American and European wages will reach a common level. Nor is such a condition necessary in order that the United States may have a merchant marine. The purpose of our subsidy is to encourage the investment of money in a merchant marine because investors will not undertake the risk of starting it alone. But when the shipping industry is once established, it will take care of itself in the face of difficulties. By standardizing the manufacture of steam locomotives, we command the markets of the world. While paying higher wages than foreign countries, we have, in five years, standardized the automobile industry and now all nations are our customers. Agricultural implements, made in America where high wages are paid, are bought in Russia, Japan, China, South America, England, and Germany. These nations whose wages are low come to America for steel rails, steel bridges,

and factory machines. Why were we able to underbid the great navy yards of Europe where wages are cheap, and secure the contract for Argentine's dreadnaughts? Simply because we have standardized; we have specialized in that industry. What we have done in these other lines of activity, we can do in the shipping industry. Give the American a fair chance and his industry and ingenuity, skill and determination will enable him to compete with any nation on the globe. Subsidize the construction of the merchant marine for ten years, as we have proposed, and we shall standardize the shipping industry as we have done in other industries.

The affirmative rests its constructive case. We have demonstrated a naval, a commercial, and an emergency need for an American merchant marine. To meet these needs, we advocate the plan of the New York Chamber of Commerce, which would establish a Shipping Board, empowered to make up present differences in the cost of construction and operation between American and foreign vessels. Such a plan is politically and economically sound.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, RALPH C. ROENCRANCE,
HILLSDALE, '16

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The position of the negative is unreasonable. The need for an adequate merchant marine is felt by every nation. Great Britain is to-day fighting for the supremacy of the seas. Russia is at war because she wants a Mediterranean seaport in which to load ships

flying the Russian flag. Germany has prepared for years for this conflict for sea power. All nations realize the value of foreign commerce and the need for ships to carry this commerce. The theory of the gentleman of the negative that we do not need a merchant marine, belongs with the philosophy of the "Hookworm." No wonder the negative are solicitous for the mountain whites. They too are mentally lazy. They would adopt a policy that does not require effort. They prefer to drift and compromise. We would recognize the need and though it may cost effort, we would have a merchant marine.

As long as we have no merchant marine of our own, we are at the mercy of foreigners in a national crisis. In case other nations are at war, we are crippled as at present. In case we are engaged in war, we need scouts, transports, colliers, etc. We showed that our cotton crop could have been sold in Germany if we had had a merchant marine. The fact that the South is a one crop section in no wise condones our past laissez-faire policy toward American shipping. Other interests have also been hurt by the closing of German markets. Michigan copper could have been sold in Germany. The needs of American manufacturers and educational institutions for German dyestuffs and apparatus could have been supplied. American science has been handicapped and textile industries have suffered. There has been a lack of ships to carry goods to Germany.

It may be true, as the Springfield *Republican* suggests, that business has fallen off but thirty per cent. and ship-

ping but twenty-five per cent., but these figures concern the whole world's shipping. You remember that Mark Twain said: "There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics." The gentlemen are guilty of using statistics that do not prove the point. Our trade with Germany has been cut off. Under international law, we have a right to trade in non-contraband goods with belligerents, unless the ports are actually blockaded. Our goods have hitherto been carried in British and German vessels. British vessels no longer seek trade in German ports, and the fact that "Britannia rules the waves" has brought about the well known scarcity of German vessels. The fact remains, however, that American vessels have the right under international law to ply the German ports. Ladies and gentlemen, we have demonstrated that an urgent need has existed for American vessels. We frankly admit our inability to remedy the present situation. The present situation must be warning to the future and the needs of the future can be met by ship subsidy.

The negative deny the naval need and in the same breath assert that Taussig, an economist whose authority they deign to recognize, says this is a valid argument. "Our geographical isolation renders us exempt from attack." But sociologists like Ross of Wisconsin tell us that compared with old world countries, America is thinly populated and that the birth rate is falling. The scrap heaps of history are piled high with the ruins of nations that have failed to provide against the invasion, by immigration or military force, of peoples

from densely populated countries. One of the main causes of the European War was the need of nations for room for expansion for surplus population. It is true, as the gentlemen assert, that we cannot name a nation that may attack, but preparation for war is the best safeguard against it.

They deprecate our foreign policies. They say they are debatable, but in spite of this fact, they are the established policy of the nation. If they are to be maintained, a navy is necessary. If we do not need a navy, they must be "scrapped." The position of the negative that we do not need a navy leads inevitably to the abandonment of these policies. Will the negative justify such a step? "He who asserts, must prove."

They urge the use of coastwise vessels as auxiliaries in case of war. Unfortunately they failed to read a recent statement in the *Literary Digest*. Filed with the War Department are lists of coastwise vessels available for transport duty. Similar lists for naval purposes are filed with the Navy Department. These lists were recently compared and found practically identical. No ship can serve two masters, the army and the navy. The fact that the army expects to use the same ships as the navy shows the need for more auxiliaries.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have accepted the challenge of the negative and have established a naval and emergency need.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, CARLETON B. MILLER,
HILLSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The argument of the negative, so far, rests on two insidious fallacies. They deny the need of an American merchant marine as long as American costs of operation and construction are greater than foreign costs. In so doing, they are involved in the "Optimistic Fallacy" and the "Fallacy of Statistics." They would close eyes to the warnings of the past. They optimistically believe that we shall never go to war. They would not raise a hand to guard our borders. Optimism is not an excuse for laziness and inertia. Our idealists have made peace treaties, it is true, but will those treaties stand when international disputes arise, involving "vital interests"? Suppose Germany's submarine campaign should result in the sinking of a large English merchant vessel and the loss of American lives. In so doing she would disobey international law which safeguards lives on merchant vessels. Would such a dispute be arbitrable? Could we wait a year and let the submarine campaign continue. Again England has violated American rights by her long distance blockade of Germany. As a neutral we are in danger of being involved in war at present. It is not a time for optimism, but a time for careful thought and practical idealism. Will the policy of the negative stand the strain? England thought the day of war over and cut down on her battleship program; an act that may have hastened the world conflagration.

The weakening of the American navy at this stage in our history may be the precursor of national decadence. The argument of the negative that there is no danger of war is a clear cut example of "Optimistic Fallacy."

Equally fallacious and weak is the secondary defense of the naval issue, in which they assert that our coast-wise fleet is adequate for naval needs. They say we ignored it. We did not. We showed that merchant vessels in time of war are needed by both army and navy. The statement of the negative provided only for naval needs. They forgot that the army also needs transports and did not include this fact in their computations. Gentlemen of the negative, statistics must be used with care. An insurance agent or a campaign orator can derive any conclusion he wishes from them. But from statistics concerning the needs of the navy, you can not draw conclusions regarding both army and navy.

The negative have contended that England and Germany at the present time are disregarding the rights of neutrals. For this reason they allege there is no emergency need for a merchant marine. Now why do they disregard the rights of neutrals? Because the neutrals have no navies large enough to command respect. Here we have the naval need. We need a strong navy in order to maintain our rights as neutrals. In arguing that there is no emergency need because belligerents trample on neutral rights, the gentlemen have admitted the naval need.

We have consistently maintained the need of an

American merchant marine. The policy of foreign governments, the convictions of the present administration, the doctrines of three American party platforms, the experiences of the past and present, all inevitably point to the same conclusion.

To meet this need we have presented a constructive measure approved by the foremost commercial organization of the country. We would make up the differences in costs of operation and construction for a period of years. We would have these differences determined scientifically by a competent board. To encourage American investment, we would have the government guarantee ship mortgages. The plan is a new one — unlike the plans of foreign countries — and is not subject to their defeats. Upon the ancient and antediluvian policies of foreign countries, the negative base their objections to ship subsidy, and in so doing they fail to meet our plan. You can find the arguments they use in any textbook on debate.

They say it is "subversive to the interests of democracy." We have shown a need and this argument falls through. It is a "dangerous precedent," but no precedent is dangerous for which a need is clearly shown. "It is incapable of just administration." If so, a great central bank such as is established by the National Reserve Act is incapable of just administration. Would the gentlemen impeach the integrity of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Reserve Board? In making such a claim, the gentlemen come very near to asserting that democracy is impossible. They say that

freight rates will not be reduced. No one made such a claim. The needs are not for lower rates. We showed a naval and emergency need and a commercial need for better service.

They argue that subsidy possesses many of the disadvantages of government ownership. It "promotes maximum costs of operation," "destroys incentive to invent." This argument does apply to the European type of subsidy, but our plan provides against that. We will just make up the difference in costs and guarantee a return on investments. Larger profits will still depend on individual initiative.

They argue further that it postpones the appearance of a self-supporting merchant marine. But the plan we advocate provides only that costs of construction shall be equalized for but ten years. The American manufacturer is given this time in which to standardize American ship building. After that he must be self-supporting. The negative would give him no chance to standardize. We would equalize costs of operation for twenty years. We will give the operator a chance in the interests of the general welfare.

We have shown a need and offered a constructive remedy. The negative have denied the need on the basis of the "Optimistic Fallacy" and the "Fallacy of Statistics." They have not attacked our specific remedy for the situation.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, HOWARD H. HICKS,
HILLSDALE, '15

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: Our plan is an attempt to straddle the fence! Our position appears inconsistent. We do not believe in government ownership of a merchant marine, but we do believe in guaranty of ship mortgages. The gentlemen very cleverly worded an objection to ship subsidy which is used by all authorities against government ownership. Government ownership repressed originality and the incentive to invent. It tends to maximum costs of operation. It fosters "red tape." These are important objections when used against government ownership of a merchant marine. In the control of vessels, invention and efficiency in operation must be encouraged. For this reason we believe in private ownership. But investors must have security. We believe guaranty of mortgages necessary and because private companies will not take it up, we would have the government perform the necessary function. Since the outbreak of the European War, the government has undertaken the business of marine insurance and with success. Insurance and the mortgage guaranty business differ from that of operating ships in one particular vital to this discussion. The need of an incentive to invent and the tendency to maximum costs of operation does not affect this work. The charge of inconsistency is not sustained. We can believe in government opera-

tion of ship guaranty business and deny the feasibility of government ownership of a merchant marine.

We submit that it is not our duty to attack the policy of government ownership further. The negative based their entire constructive case on a denial of need for an American merchant marine and of the inefficiency of old line subsidies to meet the needs. We have upheld the need in the face of their denial. In place of the old line subsidy which we admit is subject to the evils enumerated, we have submitted a plan secured by the authority of the New York Chamber of Commerce which does not possess the evils named. In their rapid retreat, the gentlemen have insinuated that an alternative remedy exists, which they did not take time to consider in constructive argument. Such an attitude indicated either an untenable position or else a remedy put forward on the spur of the moment. We have advocated a remedy which we have defended. The negative cannot insinuate that there is a remedy which they are unprepared to defend.

The history of the past month showed that the country was not ready for government ownership of a merchant marine. The plan failed because no party, as a whole, would support it.

Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen, you have two questions to decide: "Does the United States need a merchant marine for naval, commercial, and emergency purposes?" and "Is ship subsidy a reasonable method of getting a merchant marine?" In answering

the second, you should rule out any consideration of permanent government ownership as an alternative, because the negative have not seriously advocated it. You must decide whether the arguments against the old line subsidies hold against the plan adopted last month by the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Answer both questions in the affirmative and send to Congress men who believe as you do, and the time will soon come when the American flag will bring joy to the heart of the American in the farthest foreign seaports, when the American navy will be ready for any invader or to undertake any errand of mercy in support of American policies, when America will again be called the Land of Opportunity, because her markets will be the world. The free land of the past is gone, but the freedom of the markets of the world is open to that people who have a strong merchant fleet.

*HILLSDALE NEGATIVE vs. KALAMAZOO
AFFIRMATIVE*

FIRST NEGATIVE, CHAUNCEY J. HOWE, HILLSDALE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: President Lowell of Harvard has said, "Organized emotion is the main stay of the demagogue." The speaker of the affirmative has attempted to play upon your feelings, to move you to believe that the United States should have a merchant marine. We of the negative take issue directly with this statement. The negative will prove; first, we should not have a mer-

chant marine as long as the cost of construction and operation of American vessels is greater than the same costs under foreign flags; and, second, ship subsidies are political and economic evils.

The question of need for ships flying the American flag resolves itself into an alleged emergency need and a questionable permanent need. I shall consider the alleged emergency need. The debate over a remediable emergency has occupied the time of Congress for the past three months. Congress has spent much time in showing that there has been an emergency of high freight rates and restricted markets due to a lack of ships. There is no question as to high rates and restricted markets. That we admit. But we shall prove: first, that these admitted high rates to the war zones are due largely to other causes than the lack of ships; second, that there is no need for more ships; and third, even if a need for more ships could be shown, ship subsidies could not increase the number immediately.

High freight rates to the war zones exist. But the Boston *Herald* in an editorial says, "These high rates are paid on the other side of the water." In view of this why is the affirmative so concerned about high rates? However, we cannot deny, that the rise in freight rates increases the price to the foreigner thereby restricting his demand. This is the only way in which high rates are detrimental to the American commerce. And what is the cause of high rates? Secretary McAdoo and the affirmative have assumed it to be a lack of ships, but if this be true why has the rise in rates to South America

been but nominal while those to Europe have been abnormal. Surely if the lack of ships had been the only cause of high rates, South American rates would have risen as much as European rates. But Mr. McAdoo's figures do not show this.

We submit, ladies and gentlemen, that other causes have acted to such an extent that it is impossible for the affirmative to pick out one cause, like lack of ships and say, "This is the sole cause. Remedy lack of ships and you will get out of this emergency and never have another one." No! They cannot assert this.

One of the principal causes of high rates is the risk of navigation. The British war zone effective November 5th, closed the northern route, while the German war zone effective February 18th, closed all waters around the British Isles. These waters are full of contact mines and submarine boats, consequently rates are high. Within the last few weeks neutral boats have been sunk by these mines. On March 19th the *William P. Frye* was sunk by a German boat. Owners are justified in not taking these risks at the rates prevailing before the declaration of war. Would a subsidized ship ignore these risks and carry her cargo at ante bellum rates? All boats are subject to the same risks and we defy the gentlemen of the affirmative to show that a subsidized vessel flying the American flag can argue any better with a contact mine than any other ship.

These risks have made insurance on cargoes unavailable or extremely limited. Why, the rates even under the Government Insurance Bureau have been three per

cent. to Rotterdam and five per cent. to Bremen. Because of loss of so many boats, these will be raised if not abandoned entirely. If it were only two per cent. or three per cent., on six voyages a year, twelve per cent. or eighteen per cent. must be paid for war risk insurance. This would be far beyond the ordinary income on investments of capital. Take a specific instance. The insurance on a ship and cargo valued at a million dollars is \$100,000. Such insurance renders inevitable an advance in freight rates. In view of these enormous figures can our opponents hold that war risk insurance has not played a part in causing high freight rates?

In addition to risks and war insurance another cause for higher rates is the congestion of freight in ports of belligerents resulting in long delays in discharge of cargoes and involving enormous additional expenses which must be made up in added freight rates. Scarcity of dock laborers is one cause of this congestion. Norman Hill, an English authority, says, "The *main* cause is beyond question the shortage of labor." It is said that labor is so scarce that stevedores who do work receive such wages as enables them to go on a drunk every night instead of once a week as usual. Another cause of congestion is the fact that commercial traffic yields to that related to the military situation. At Genoa a few days ago thirty ships were waiting to be unloaded. Does this look like a lack of ships? And when boats are thus held up they are at a frightful added expense and so this congestion in ports justifies increased rates.

Another cause added to the risk of navigation, war-

insurance, and congestion in ports, is the uncertainty of return cargoes and a return supply of coal. When return cargoes are not available, a boat is compelled to charge extra for the cargo carried one way. Also coal is not obtainable on account of its war use. This delay, therefore, must be made up in added rates. The gentlemen of the affirmative must show us that subsidized vessels will make return cargoes possible and compel foreign countries to furnish us return coal.

In addition to risk of navigation, war-insurance, congestion in ports of belligerents, uncertainty of return cargoes and coal, a further cause of high rates, is the loss to the ship companies of money formerly coming from the passenger traffic which is now almost entirely cut off. The *La Touraine* sailed from New York a few days ago with but 84 passengers. What passenger traffic loses, the freight end of the business must make up. Our friends of a subsidy might just as well advocate the spending of the money in excursions to the European battle fields, for until passenger traffic is resumed, freight rates cannot be normal.

Now since each and every one of these causes: first, risk of navigation; second, unavailable or limited war-risk insurance; third, congestion in ports of belligerents; fourth, uncertainty of return cargoes and coal; and fifth, the lack of passenger traffic have resulted in present high rates, we, therefore, maintain that it is impossible for our opponents to claim that the alleged lack of ships is the only cause. Furthermore, none of these causes has operated in the South American trade. The war has

taken as many boats from this trade as any other and yet rates have only slightly advanced. Again, I ask my opponents, if the lack of ships is the sole cause of high rates, why have rates not advanced the same in the South American trade?

Having proved that lack of ships is not the only cause of increased rates, I will now show absolutely no need for more ships. We admit a certain decrease in the number of ships due to commandeering, sinking, and interning, but investigation shows that the lack of markets more than offsets the decrease in ships. The *Springfield Republican* of February 18th says, "While the world's shipping has lost twenty-five per cent. of its tonnage, business has fallen off thirty per cent." German and Austrian markets have been closed by blockade. Trade opportunities have disappeared and this restriction of market offsets the decrease of tonnage. Also a breakdown in the system of credits and exchanges particularly in cotton has closed many markets. Three-fourths of the world's business is done on credit and when credit facilities fail there must be a loss of trade. The London cotton exchange is entirely closed and London exchanges even affect our South American trade. Therefore, since business has fallen off on account of this breakdown in credits and exchanges thirty per cent., and the loss of tonnage by the war is only twenty-five per cent., wherein, I ask, is there a need for more ships?

Again, even in spite of the fact that our trade with England, Germany, Austria, and Belgium has greatly decreased, the balance of trade in favor of the United

States for this year to date is \$150,000,000. The New York Board of Commerce says that exports from New York alone during January and the first week of February were almost \$29,000,000 in excess of the exports for the same period in 1914. Foreign trade for the week ending February 6th exported by the Department of Commerce from the thirteen principal custom ports showed a balance of \$37,134,266 in favor of the United States, the largest weekly balance on record. This vast commerce has been successfully moved in spite of the clamor about the lack of ships. Neither the wheat farmers, the horse raisers, the steel producers, the shoe manufacturers, or any of the other trades have joined in a cry for a subsidized marine, because of a shortage of ships. They haven't because their products have been moved successfully. Some ships from somewhere must have transported these huge freights. Therefore, there can be no lack of ships and if no lack, surely no need for any more. Now since markets have decreased to a greater per cent. than the loss of tonnage due to the withdrawal of credit and closing of exchanges, and since our exports are greater since the war began than in any other period of our history and thus shows no emergency from the lack of transportation, we, therefore, maintain that there is no need to increase the number of ships.

Now, if this need for more ships could be shown, not admitting for a moment that it can, for I have shown conclusively that it can not, but if it could be shown to exist, ship subsidies could not increase the number immediately. Subsidy to boats already built and in the

service will not remedy the alleged lack of ships. The building of new boats will take at least seven months. But seven months from now there will be no more need for ships than there is now. Our banner crops will have been moved by the present ships. The purchase and subsidizing of German vessels has been advocated, but international law interpreted by France forbids this. The German ship, *Dacia*, bought by a Michigan man in good faith has been captured and is now in the hands of a French prize court. What is to be gained by buying a quarrel with every ship purchased? I am not one of those who say with bluff old Commodore Hull, "My country, may she always be in the right, but right or wrong, my country."

Assuming temporarily that these German boats could be bought without international complications, they are undesirable and not fitted for the commercial traffic because nearly seventy-five per cent. are passenger boats. Thus far the affirmative has not dwelt on any need for this type of vessel. Subsidy then cannot meet the alleged emergency needs because it cannot increase the number of ships in the service without building, because interned ships cannot be bought and subsidized on account of international law and because most of them are passenger boats.

In conclusion: Since the high rates to war zones are largely due to other causes than the lack of ships, since there is no need for more ships and since even if there was a need (not admitting that there is) ship subsidies could not increase the number immediately, we, there-

fore, maintain that a strong American merchant marine would not have prevented the present emergency nor would such a marine be a safeguard against future emergencies of the same kind.

My colleague will prove that there is no need for ships flying the American flag so long as cost of foreign construction and operation is lower than ours and also that subsidies are social and political evils.

SECOND NEGATIVE, FRED W. SEITZ, HILLSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The entire argument of the affirmative is based on the assumed fact that the United States needs a larger merchant marine. There are three reasons on which to base the need for a larger merchant marine: first, an urgent emergency need; second, a permanent naval need; and third, a permanent commercial need. My colleague has already established the fact that there is no emergency need for a larger merchant marine by showing: first, that the high freight rates which exist are due to other causes than the lack of ships; second, there are sufficient ships to supply the demand; and third, even if a need for more vessels could be established a ship subsidy could not immediately relieve the situation.

I shall show in my constructive argument that there is no permanent need of a larger merchant marine flying the American flag so long as the costs of construction and operation remain more under the United States government than under foreign governments for two reasons: first, there is no need for a larger American mer-

chant marine to supplement our navy in time of war; second, there is no need of a larger American merchant marine to carry on our foreign commerce.

The contention of the gentlemen of the affirmative that we need a merchant marine to act as a naval auxiliary presupposes the fact that we are going to war within the next quarter of a century, for the merchant marine which we build now will be obsolete and utterly useless for naval purposes twenty-five years hence. But we will double that time and ask them, "What country is going to attack us in fifty years?" And before they can hope to establish a naval need for a larger merchant marine, they must show beyond a reasonable doubt that we shall be attacked within the next half century, for if we fight at all it will be a war of defense since President Wilson voiced the sentiments of every true American when he said that the United States would never wage another aggressive war. The only great powers that we have any cause to fear are England, France, Germany, Japan, Austria, and Russia. South American countries we can dismiss from the list for lack of navies as we can for the very same reason, Austria and Russia. This leaves but four countries to prepare for. If we have any cause to fear England, we must first fortify the three thousand miles of boundary between us and Canada which for a century has remained totally unprotected. France has not yet recovered from the Franco-Prussian War nor even from the Napoleonic wars which drained her best blood. Germany will be too exhausted after the present war owing to the depletion of her army, navy,

merchant marine, and financial resources to engage in another immediately. As for Japan she is three coaling stations away from our Pacific Coast without a single coaling station to serve her. Thus we have eliminated any great possibility of war for fifty years, and until the gentlemen of the opposition can show a reasonable probability of war in the face of these facts, they can not hope to establish a naval need for a merchant marine.

But even if war should come with a demand for merchant vessels, we can meet that demand. For in his report to the Senate on January 20, 1915 in regard to the naval need, Secretary Daniels made this statement: "The number of vessels to supply an oversea fleet is dependent upon the distance from the base of supplies, and for the most distant oversea field of naval activity, it is estimated to be 200 vessels." And even if our adversaries can establish the probability of war, before they can bring forward any argument for a larger merchant marine as a naval auxiliary, they must show that our coastwise fleet is inadequate and inefficient to supply the necessary two hundred ships.

Moreover, if they should succeed in establishing this they must show beyond doubt that our heavy ocean going coastwise fleet together with our merchant marine comprising a total of 2,360 ships of a total tonnage of nearly five million tons could not supply these two hundred ships.

Another reason why we do not need a large merchant marine is that it would be a source of weakness rather

than strength in time of war. This is so self-evident that it needs no proof. For every vessel engaged in commerce in time of war must be accompanied by one or more warships for protection against the enemy's fleets.

A favorite plan of the subsidist is to offer a bounty to ships built to act as merchant vessels in time of peace and auxiliary cruisers in time of war. But we submit the fact that war vessels are so highly specialized now that owing to the requirements of cruisers as regards room for coal bunkers and special engines, vessels cannot be built that are really efficient for both naval and commercial uses. And since this is so, we maintain that it is expensive economy to build useless auxiliaries to make inefficient merchant ships. It is just as preposterous for a wealthy nation to use an inefficient freight or passenger boat for heavy naval duty as it is for a wealthy magnate to buy an expensive pleasure car to use on holidays and then for economy's sake to use that car as a delivery truck on work days. It can be done but we place those people, who advocate it in the state institution for the mentally incompetent.

Moreover, this policy has been used by England with so little success that the British Admiralty reported in 1902 that the money already spent was practically wasted and they recommended that the practice be stopped. And yet in spite of this fact subsidy advocates cling tenaciously to this straw in the overwhelming maelstrom of opposition and urge a naval subsidy.

We have spent this amount of time on the naval need because Taussig, the great economist, says that it is the

only argument for a merchant marine worth considering. For these reasons, then, we maintain that there is no naval need for a larger merchant marine: First, there is no probability of war for fifty years; second, in case of war we have our coastwise fleet which with our ocean-going merchant marine, a total of 2,360 ships, will be more than adequate to supply any naval need which at most is 200 ships; third, a large merchant marine is a source of weakness in time of war; and fourth, efficient vessels can not be built for both naval and commercial uses.

My second point is that we do not need a larger merchant marine flying the American flag to carry our foreign trade so long as the costs of construction and operation are more under the United States flag than under foreign flags. A matter which raises a great "hue and cry" from those who advocate a subsidy and on which our opponents have, without stating it in so many words, based their contention for a permanent commercial need for a larger merchant marine is that "trade follows the flag." With the subsidy advocates this is "both slogan and argument." To disprove this we need only to consider the history of our merchant marine and trade. From 1826, when our American ships carried ninety-two per cent. of our foreign trade, our merchant marine has declined until now it carries only about ten per cent. of our commerce. If the argument were true that trade follows the flag, our foreign trade would have declined as the merchant marine did, but as a matter of fact it increased tremendously. And still it is claimed that

"trade follows the flag"! The gentlemen of the opposition advocate that we establish regular ship lines to places where trade has not yet developed. Perhaps to the cannibal islands in the South Seas! Then they say trade will follow. They advocate that we deliver goods without having sold them. But to establish further that trade does not follow the flag, let me quote from Royal Meeker's book on "Ship Subsidies." "Our commerce with the Levant grew so that the Hamburg-American line established a regular freight service from New York to the Eastern Mediterranean." Thus we can readily see that trade does not follow the flag.

The last reason why we do not need a larger American merchant marine is that it is more economical to employ foreign ship owners to carry our goods. In the first place, as we have stated, the cost of construction and operation is more under the American Government than under the governments of foreign nations. Our opponents have admitted this. Statistics vary from twenty-five per cent. to one hundred per cent. construction and from five per cent. to fifty, per cent. in operation in favor of the foreigner. But, however great it may be, it is self-evident that this handicap to American ship owners has made it possible for foreigners to underbid our ship owners and so has made it more economical for our merchants to patronize foreign ships.

The most telling economic argument of the subsidy advocates has been that the great amount of from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 that we pay annually to foreigners for freight rates is utterly lost to us. And yet

this amount has been pouring from our country for years and still the international balance of trade is in our favor to the amount of \$500,000,000 annually. Meeker says this which is perfectly obvious: "If we pay foreigners ever so many millions for service which would cost more if we did it ourselves, there is nothing but economic gain for us in the transaction." (Page 206, "Ship Subsidies.")

Is it not logical? Is it not sound business to get service at the lowest price? You buy fruit from an Italian fruit store simply because you get more and better goods for your money. The affirmative maintain that we do not get good service from foreign ship owners. But the ship owner is after money and he will give good service for it because there are always competitors ready to take his place. Although the Chinaman does not love the Irishman, he will wash his collars for money as quickly as he will any one else's. The average business man is after the money, and he must have it. He will do business where he can make cash easiest. Thus we find that foreign ship owners can carry our trade cheaper than our own ship owners can carry it and so it is more economical to patronize him because the American owner is handicapped by an increased cost of construction and operation, because foreigners give us efficient service, and since the argument that we lose money paid to foreigners for freight rates is fallacious.

I have now shown that we do not need a larger merchant marine to carry our foreign trade, for: First, trade does not follow the flag; and, second, because it is

more economical to employ foreign ship owners than American owners. For these reasons then, and for the reasons cited before that we do not need a merchant marine to supplement our navy in time of war: First, that there is no probability of war, second, that in case of war we have our coast-wise fleet; third, our combined coast-wise and ocean going shipping will be more than sufficient to aid our navy; fourth, that a large merchant marine is a source of weakness in time of war; and, fifth, that vessels cannot be built efficient for both naval and commercial uses, we maintain that we do not need a larger merchant marine so long as the costs of construction and operation are more under the American flag than under foreign flags.

My colleague will show that a ship subsidy is impracticable and unnecessary.

THIRD NEGATIVE, FERRIS BRISCOE, HILLSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: We shall grant, for the sake of argument, that the Southern cotton crop could have been sold in Germany if we had possessed a merchant marine. We shall grant also, for the sake of argument, that a subsidy investment of ten million dollars per annum begun ten years ago would have furnished us such a merchant marine. The principal of such a subsidy investment would have amounted to one hundred million dollars to establish a parasitic American shipping industry. Will the gentlemen show that the South will ultimately lose that much on its 1914 cotton crop, and having done so, will

the gentlemen justify the policy whereby the whole country must insure the poor industrial conditions of the South? The South has invested its all in one crop. Her present condition is the result of that short-sighted policy. This situation may prove a blessing in disguise. "Necessity is the mother of invention." In the future, the South will plant other crops and who knows but that in the future her agricultural prosperity will date from the period of the European War when the folly of her agricultural methods became evident? The gentlemen asked the question, "Could we have sold the Southern cotton crop if we had had ships?" We counter this question, "Would it have been policy for the nation to insure the poor industrial methods of the South by means of ship subsidy?"

We asked the affirmative to show the possibility of war, and they have answered, "Look at Belgium." We reiterate, "Look at Belgium." Belgium was not isolated geographically. There were not three thousand miles of water between her and Germany. No coaling stations were needed before entering her dominions. Show us the nation that will attack us, or else show us what we have to gain by a war of aggression. We attacked the policy of paying American ship owners more than European for the same service. They named a list of authorities. We gave reasons. We demand either that the gentlemen refute our reasons or else show us that the reasoning of their authorities is better than our reasoning.

They asserted that ship subsidy is politically and eco-

nomically advantageous. Let us consider. I shall prove that ship subsidy is a political blunder and an economic fallacy. Ship subsidy is subversive to the interests of democracy, in that it taxes the many for the benefit of the few. Our cities are now engaged in a gigantic struggle to free themselves from the civic slavery and degradation resulting from franchises granted to private capital. With this iniquitous failure of municipal franchise staring us in the face, is it wisdom to begin granting *national* franchises to private capital?

Shipping subsidies set up a dangerous precedent. If ships are subsidized, every delinquent industry in the country has a just demand to a subsidy. The farmer, suffering from a disastrous crop failure, has the same right to a subsidy as the ship owner. If we raid the national treasury to aid the shipping industry, we cannot in justice stop short of raiding the national treasury to aid every delinquent enterprise in the country.

In addition to being an undemocratic measure, a vicious national franchise, and an evil precedent, a shipping subsidy is incapable of a just administration. If all ships are subsidized, the economic loss and the enormous drain upon the national treasury would make the subsidy an absurdity, if not an impossibility. On the other hand, if the subsidy is limited to only a portion of the merchant marine, our government is guilty of the rankest kind of favoritism to a few interests. The gentlemen of the affirmative must meet this objection, that a universal ship subsidy is an economic waste and a financial impossibility, while a limited subsidy is an undemo-

cratic, un-American discrimination in favor of a few capitalists.

Again, in the case of freight rates, if the subsidy merely makes up the difference in the cost of construction and operation, as the gentlemen advocate, it will *not* reduce freight rates a single cent. If on the other hand, it more than makes up the difference in the cost of construction and operation, it is an iniquitous gift of all the people to a favored few. Therefore, any argument for a subsidy on the ground of a reduction of freight rates is an impossibility. Gentlemen of the affirmative, will your plan reduce freight rates?

A ship subsidy is a measure for the benefit of a few capitalists, it is an evil national franchise, it sets a dangerous industrial precedent, it is incapable of just administration without economic waste and cannot reduce freight rates. Beyond these considerations, a ship subsidy promotes a tendency to maximum cost of operation, destroys the incentive to invent and improve, and enables the subsidized ships to maintain a poor and inferior service. Take the case of the Cunard Steamship Co. This company has enjoyed a subsidy from the British Government under the guise of a mail subvention since before the Civil War. As a result, the Cunard Company was from ten to fifteen years behind unsubsidized companies in adopting screw propellers and the other progressive inventions and improvements of steam navigation. This restriction of improvement, resulting from the subsidy, was not confined to the Cunard Company alone. Indeed, Professor Royal A. Meeker, special com-

missioner of the United States to South America and eminent authority on shipping subsidies, says that the subsidy given to the Cunards by England long delayed the improvement in steam navigation of all trans-Atlantic transportation. Further than this, the Cunard Company long maintained a service, far inferior to that of the unsubsidized lines, both as regards schedule and accommodations. The conditions were due to the fact that the Cunards had a gift out of the British treasury to fall back upon and so did not have to adopt improvements or furnish decent service to reap their profits, thus proving our contention that a ship subsidy kills the incentive to invent and improve, and enables the ship owners to profit by impoverishing the efficiency of the marine.

—More than being a vicious national franchise for the benefit of the few, more than establishing a dangerous economic precedent, more than being incapable of a just administration and unable to reduce freight rates, more than destroying the incentive to improvement and efficiency, a ship subsidy given American shipping at the present time would delay indefinitely the establishment of an economically independent American merchant marine. The day of such a marine is not far off, and the last gentleman admitted it. The New York Chamber of Commerce, a body committed to the subsidy idea, in its report of January, 1915, states that the cost of construction now varies but from five per cent. to ten per cent. between Europe and America. Ten years ago even modest advocates claimed that it varied forty per cent.

The difference in cost of construction has shrunk from forty per cent. to between five per cent. and ten per cent. in a decade, showing that the cost of construction in America is rapidly becoming equal to that abroad. Just as soon as American shipbuilding is standardized, the cost of construction at home will equal the cost abroad.

The only other ground upon which subsidy can be urged is the difference in the cost of labor necessary to the operation of a merchant marine. Economic forces now at work are rapidly eliminating this difference also. Our frontier has disappeared. Men can no longer go west and take up land when dissatisfied with the wages they receive. The result is a standardization of American wages. Wages are no longer subject to any material increase. Add to this fact the great increase in population, that is the increase in the labor supply, and the American wage must remain constant. Wages in Europe, however, are bound to rise tremendously. The soldier, returning from the war with a broader view of life and an acquaintance with the world, will never again submit to the degrading low wage for which he labored before the war. Further, the war, by killing off thousands upon thousands of European laborers and destroying untold amounts of property, will create a great scarcity in the foreign labor market. A tremendous increase in the European wage will result. With the American wage stationary and the European wage increasing enormously, the point is soon reached where the cost of American labor equals the cost of European labor. The differences in the cost of construction and labor equal-

ized, an American merchant marine, economically sound and independent, will appear upon the seas, for American enterprise has more than proved its ability to compete with the world under equal conditions.

A subsidy given to the American marine at this time will create an artificial stimulation of the industry. It would raid the national treasury to create a condition economically unsound, a condition destructive to the forces that are now hastening the day of an economically sound and independent merchant marine. The day of such a marine is at hand. Is it wisdom, now to spend millions of dollars merely to postpone this day indefinitely? The gentlemen of the affirmative must meet this proposition if they would win this debate. The negative has shown that we are at present handling a greater volume of foreign trade than ever before; that there is no congestion of American products at home; that the present high ocean rates are caused by: First, the increased risk of navigation; second, unavailable or limited war-risk insurance; third, congestion in the ports of belligerents; fourth, uncertainty of obtaining return cargoes and coal in foreign ports; and fifth, lack of passenger traffic, and therefore that an increased number of ships could not possibly relieve the present situation.

The negative has shown further that so long as foreigners can build and operate ships to carry our commerce cheaper than we can, there is no need for a merchant marine flying the American flag; that we as a nation do not suffer by letting foreigners transport our products, but rather gain economically by so doing.

We have shown further that a large merchant marine is not needed from a naval standpoint for there is no nation that can attack us in the next half century; our geographical isolation renders impossible any attack upon us; that merchant ships are not suitable for use as auxiliary navies. We have shown further, that even in the event of war, which we do not admit possible, if merchant ships should be demanded for naval service, which again we do not admit possible, there is an ample supply of such ships from our coastwise marine.

Further than this, we have proved that a subsidy is wrong in principle and an economic mistake; that it is a measure for the benefit of the few; that it is a vicious national franchise; that it sets up a dangerous economic precedent for all subsidies; that it is incapable of a just administration; that it cannot reduce freight rates; that it kills the incentive to invent and promotes inefficiency and, in the last place, that a subsidy would only postpone the day of an economically sound marine—a day that we have proved to be at hand.

In short, we have proved that under present conditions, there is no need of a merchant marine and that when these conditions have changed, that an American marine, economically sound, will appear upon the seas without a raid upon the national treasury.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, CHAUNCEY HOWE,
HILLSDALE, '18

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The need for an American merchant marine

must be shown before any attempt is made to justify ship subsidies. The affirmative have proposed three needs. Because of the weakness of the emergency need, they have merely suggested conclusions to be drawn from a few admitted facts. Here is the evidence. High rates to the war zone exist. Rates to South America have risen though not as much. Trade with Germany and Austria Hungary is at a standstill. Trade with South America is slow. The South is suffering because it cannot sell its cotton crop. These are the facts upon which both sides are agreed. We of the negative disagree emphatically with the conclusions drawn from these facts.

We asked them if they would remedy the present high rates by adopting a ship subsidy policy. The delightful vagueness of their main argument on this issue might lead one to expect that they could. When we consider, however, the impossibility of building ships immediately and the international complications attendant to buying interned ships, together with the fact that most of these are passenger vessels unfit for merchant vessels, we hardly blame our affirmative friends for making the argument vague. In answer to direct questioning on the point, they have yielded ground and admitted their inability to remedy the present emergency. They cling, however, to an opinion that present high rates and restricted markets would have been prevented by the adoption of a subsidy policy ten years ago and argue that subsidy will be protection against another similar condition. Let us consider carefully the effect of more American

vessels. Present high rates are due to war zone risks. The affirmative have ignored my question asked in constructive argument. "Can an American vessel argue any better with a contact mine than any other ship?" They are subject to the same risks. They have ignored the authority of the Springfield *Republican*, which states that "while the world's shipping has fallen off twenty-five per cent. trade has fallen off thirty per cent." In the face of these figures, are more American ships needed? High rates are due to war risks.

The question, therefore, of an emergency need rests on two issues. First, are high rates to war zones due to lack of ships? Second, can subsidy remedy present situation? The affirmative admit that subsidy cannot remedy the present situation. They have failed to show that high rates are due to lack of ships and that there is need for more ships.

Because of the fact that their alleged needs for an American merchant marine are weak, the affirmative have attempted to make up in number where they have failed in quality. Rather than one urgent need, they submit three weak ones. In order to show a naval need, they enumerated our responsibilities; our Philippine policy, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Open Door in China. These policies are questionable. We are considering their abandonment. The sale of the Philippines has been seriously considered. If it were not for our system of indirect taxation wherein the individual does not realize the amount he expends for the support of a Pork Barrel Government, the Philippines would have been sold

long ago. We are paying millions for the education of the Filipino, and the mountain white of the South is deprived of education and other blessings with the exception of "Hookworm." Professor Bingham of Yale writes a book entitled "The Monroe Doctrine an Obsolete Shibboleth" and many others believe it is to national advantage to abandon it. The "Open Door Policy" reads well on paper, but will the affirmative show that it is ever considered seriously? The administration believes in "watchful waiting" in Mexico. Should the policy be any different toward Japanese aggression in China? Will the gentlemen of the affirmative show us a probability of defensive war or will they justify a war of aggression in support of the doubtful policies which they have named?

Not only have they failed to show the possibility of war, but they have not answered our arguments that the coastwise fleet is sufficient for naval purposes and that a merchant marine is a source of weakness in case of war.

In conclusion, the emergency need for a merchant marine is not established, because it has not been shown that high rates are caused by lack of ships. There is no naval need, because there is no probability of war; and in case of a war, which we do not admit possible, the coastwise fleet is sufficient.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, FRED W. SEITZ,
HILSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The affirmative makes frantic efforts to cover its tracks. The emergency argument rests, they maintain, on the fact that we are shut off from German markets. Under international law, we are told that American vessels have the right to carry to ports in Germany goods that are not contraband. This argument rests on the supposition that England and Germany are conducting the war according to international law, which is contrary to fact. Under international law, England's long distance blockade of Germany and Germany's submarine campaign are glaring violations of neutral rights. If an American merchant fleet had been in existence, both nations would have taken all possible steps to stop trade with the other. The British blockade might have gone into effect even sooner.

As for the naval argument, the possibility of war is not shown. They ask us whether we could abandon the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door Policy. They should be given up. They are contradictory. One would confine American action to this country, while the other would make us responsible for the cause of democracy in China. It is insolent for any nation to set itself as the standard of government and as guardian of other nations. It is a pious garb and covers many sins of exploitation. The Monroe Doctrine has won for us the hatred of the South American republics. A.

Garcia Calderon, the Peruvian diplomat, makes a statement to the effect that the Latin American countries would prefer German or Japanese invasion to American exploitation and hypocrisy. In many South American countries they call us the "Great Pigs of the North," and have turned trade to our European competitors. The ownership of the Philippines and Hawaii is inconsistent with our anti-imperialistic policy. They have cost us more than they will ever repay. Rather than maintain an army and navy for their protection, we would give them away. We agree with the Mobile Declaration of President Wilson, and do not believe in a navy as a means to keep from wars of aggression. Military power made beasts of the Germans, and Americans may well be warned against attempted naval supremacy.

Our quotation from Professor Taussig of Harvard was misinterpreted. He says that while the naval argument is the most valid one, a navy is an unnecessary burden.

In constructive argument we showed, by means of quotations from Secretary Daniels regarding needs for naval auxiliaries and from statistics concerning the size of the coastwise fleet, that we have sufficient naval auxiliaries. This argument has been ignored.

Besides failing to show naval and emergency needs, the gentlemen have ignored our contention regarding the commercial needs. The United States does need broader markets, but she does not need to pay Ameri-

cans more than foreigners for the same service. They do not say they will send goods cheaper. If your wife's uncle keeps a store, do you expect to pay him more for goods than some one else? No, you'll send the old parasite to the poor farm first. If American business fails to stand on its own feet, we will do business with foreigners.

American trade has increased in the past, although foreigners have carried it. Our South American trade will increase just as fast as we learn the needs of that trade. We have failed in the past to take foreign trade seriously. We did not need to. But now that the need is here, conditions show signs of improvement. Better salesmen, better credit facilities, more amicable relations with South America to be procured by abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, and above all cheaper foreign shipping facilities will solve the problem for the present. Gradually American shipping will overcome the handicaps of costs of construction and operation. America may expect to overcome the construction costs right away. The demand for ships in England because of losses, together with the great demand for laborers in other industries, will raise wages and standardization in America will be fast. The matter of operation will take more time, but will come. Then we may satisfy even the sentiment of the gentlemen of the affirmative whose love for the flag is second only to their love for the subsidy dollar.

On the Isle of Man, juries often hand in the quaint verdict, "Not Proven." As regards the alleged need

for an American merchant marine, the verdict is likewise, "Not Proven."

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, FERRIS BRISCOE,
HILLSDALE, '17

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentleman who preceded me summed up, saying that they had shown a need. The evidence is in. We are agreed that the need is a fundamental issue. The question is in your hands. Have we been too optimistic in denying the probability of war? Have the gentlemen shown that the present emergency of high rates and restricted markets is due to lack of ships? Have they justified the policy of paying Americans more than foreigners for the same service?

The gentlemen are inconsistent. In arguing for an American merchant marine, they listed such men as President Wilson, Secretary McAdoo, and others as believing that the United States needs a merchant marine. They neglected to state, however, that these men oppose ship subsidy as a remedy and advocate government ownership. President Wilson does not believe in subsidy. He supported the Alexander Bill, which involves government ownership. We point out this fact to show the gentlemen have parted company with their illustrious authorities. Even though they demonstrated a need, they must defend subsidy as a remedy.

They advocated a plan fathered by the New York Chamber of Commerce. They presented it as entirely new. They dubbed it scientific. But they failed to

show that it will not be subject to discrimination. Whose costs of construction and operation are to be made up? Here are the horns of the dilemma. If they favor all constructors and operators, men will build, not to catch traffic, but to catch the subsidy. You cannot subsidize every one. But if you do not subsidize all comers, you discriminate against those left out. Will the gentlemen explain the justice of such a measure? The Jacksonian Spoils System provided that offices should be passed around. Perhaps the gentlemen would pass the subsidy around.

They have pictured for you an all-wise, omniscient, omnipotent board which would attend to the details which the affirmative was unable to attend to. Where are they going to get this board? They compared it with the Central Reserve Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission; but the efficiency of the Central Reserve Board is still untried, while the Interstate Commerce Commission has not been as yet a distinct success. The Board System is still on trial.

Here we have their system—a scientific method of finding differences in costs of construction and operation by an all-wise board. They would further guarantee ship mortgages. Do they realize that Brazil tried a similar scheme when she attempted the valorization of coffee; that she undertook to store the coffee for a rise in price? Do they realize that this attempt to subsidize the industry resulted so disastrously that our own government refused to attempt the same for the last cotton crop? “Guarantee ship mortgages because farm mort-

gages are successful." But there is no analogy between ship mortgages and farm mortgages. Real estate is not movable, cannot fluctuate in value greatly from year to year, while ships are movable, can meet with icebergs, derelicts, bad weather, and other ships. Besides government operation of such an industry has never proved trustworthy. We have shown that an alleged need of a merchant marine has been made to lead to two conclusions: ship subsidy and government ownership. We believe in neither, but we ask the gentlemen, "Do you believe in government ownership?" Inasmuch as we of the negative will have no time to refute their answer, let me consider the possible answers. If they say, "We believe in government ownership," they repudiate ship subsidy as a remedy. If they say, "We do not believe in government ownership," they demonstrate the inconsistency of their plan which is a hybrid between government ownership and subsidy. They have attempted to sit on the fence. Their plan, like a two-headed Janus, has betrayed them. Will the gentlemen show us the reasonableness of a plan which decries the efficiency of government ownership of a merchant marine and advocates government ownership of a guarantee bureau?

The negative closes its case. It has maintained the folly of a merchant marine under present conditions where costs of operation and construction are less under foreign flags. The naval, commercial, and emergency needs of the affirmative rest upon assumptions that there is possibility of war, that the coastwise fleet is insuffi-

cient for naval purposes, that an American merchant marine could have stopped the British policy of long distance blockade, and that American trade demands carriage in American boats. All of these propositions we have emphatically disproved. Their so-called "constructive" remedy is a hybrid between government ownership and ship subsidy — an attempt to straddle the fence.

HILLSDALE BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND ARTICLES WITH GOOD BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Clifford, C. A. *Selected Articles on Ship Subsidy*. (Debaters' Handbook.)

Dunmore, *Ship Subsidies*. (Hart, Schaffner & Marx Essay.)

Independent. A Debate—Both Sides—*Government Ownership of Merchant Marine*. February 8, 1915.

Library of Congress. List of books with references to periodicals on *Mercantile Marine Subsidies*. (1906.)

Library of Congress. Additional References relating to *Mercantile Marine Subsidies*.

Pearson, P. M., Editor *Intercollegiate Debates*. Debate on *Ship Subsidies Between Bowdoin and Vermont*. pp. 405-431.

OTHER BOOKS

W. W. Bates. *American Navigation*.

Boston Chamber of Commerce. *Report on Merchant Marine*. 1915.

Johnson, E. R. *Ocean and Inland Water Transportation*.

Marvin, W. L. *American Merchant Marine*.

Meeker, Royal. *History of Shipping Subsidies*.

New York Chamber of Commerce. Report on Merchant Marine, 1915. (Gives working plan of subsidy.)

Reports. Majority and Minority of Senate and House of Representatives on the Alexander Bill. 1914.

Report. *Merchant Marine Commission*.

Seager. *Economics*.

Seligman. *Economics*.

Statesman's Year Book. 1905, 1906, 1913.

Taussig. *Principles of Economics*.

United States Rules Committee (House). Investigations of Shipping Trust. 1912. 59th Congress, first session. House Document 5641.

Wells. *Decay of Our Ocean Mercantile Marine, Its Cause and Cure*.

ADDRESSES

McAdoo, Wm. G. Before Commercial Club at Chicago. *United States Congressional Record*. 52:1594-1600. Jan. 14, 1915.

Wilson, Woodrow. *Annual Presidential Message*. *Congressional Record*. 52:19-21. Dec. 8, 1914.

Redfield, W. C. *Address before Naval Architects*. Nov. 22, 1912. Government Printing Office.

LETTERS

Principal Chambers of Commerce of United States.

MAGAZINES (a few late references)

American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals. 55: 1306. Sept., 1914.

Arena. 28:606-616. June, 1900.

Atlantic Monthly. 113:796-803. June, 1914.

Century. 88:339-348. July, 1914.

Literary Digest. 48:542, March 14, 1914; 49:290-292, Aug. 22, 1914; 50:81-83, Jan. 16, 1915.

New Republic. 1: No. 11, 18-19. Jan. 16, 1915.

Outlook. 107:1033. Aug. 29, 1914.

Review of Reviews. 50:329-333. Sept., 1914.

Scientific American. 111:110, Aug. 15, 1914; 111:282-283, Oct. 3, 1914.

Congressional Records. Jan. 1, March 4, 1915.

Independent. 79:298-299. Aug. 31, 1914.

Seager. *Economics*.

Seligman. *Economics*.

Statesman's Year Book. 1905, 1906, 1913.

Taussig. *Principles of Economics*.

United States Rules Committee (House). Investigations of Shipping Trust. 1912. 59th Congress, first session. House Document 5641.

Wells. *Decay of Our Ocean Mercantile Marine, Its Cause and Cure*.

ADDRESSES

McAdoo, Wm. G. Before Commercial Club at Chicago. *United States Congressional Record*. 52:1594-1600. Jan. 14, 1915.

Wilson, Woodrow. *Annual Presidential Message. Congressional Record*. 52:19-21. Dec. 8, 1914.

Redfield, W. C. *Address before Naval Architects*. Nov. 22, 1912. Government Printing Office.

LETTERS

Principal Chambers of Commerce of United States.

MAGAZINES (a few late references)

American Academy of Political and Social Science Annals. 55: 1306. Sept., 1914.

Arena. 28:606-616. June, 1900.

Atlantic Monthly. 113:796-803. June, 1914.

Century. 88:339-348. July, 1914.

Literary Digest. 48:542, March 14, 1914; 49:290-292, Aug. 22, 1914; 50:81-83, Jan. 16, 1915.

New Republic. 1: No. 11, 18-19. Jan. 16, 1915.

Outlook. 107:1033. Aug. 29, 1914.

Review of Reviews. 50:329-333. Sept., 1914.

Scientific American. 111:110, Aug. 15, 1914; 111:282-283, Oct. 3, 1914.

Congressional Records. Jan. 1, March 4, 1915.

Independent. 79:298-299. Aug. 31, 1914.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

*COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE vs.
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES OF KAN-
SAS AND OKLAHOMA*

In the annual triangular debates between the agricultural colleges of Colorado, Kansas and Oklahoma, held on March 19, 1915, each institution was victorious on the affirmative of the compulsory military service question. The Colorado affirmative met the Kansas negative at Fort Collins, Colorado. The Colorado negative met Oklahoma affirmative at Stillwater, Oklahoma, and the Kansas affirmative met the Oklahoma negative at Manhattan, Kansas. Each victory was by the unanimous vote of the judges.

Each speaker was allowed eighteen minutes for a constructive speech and five minutes for refutation and rebuttal. The affirmative opened and closed the debate.

The question as debated was stated as follows:

Resolved, that all able-bodied citizens of the United States should be compelled to perform one year's continuous military service before attaining the age of twenty-five years.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Alfred Westfall, instructor in English at the Colorado Agricultural College and coach of debate, the editor of *Intercollegiate Debates* was given the opportunity of publishing this debate on the timely subject of militarism.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

*COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE vs.
KANSAS AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE*

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, R. BRUCE MCKEOWN, COLORADO
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17**

Ladies and Gentlemen: The question as stated is, Resolved that every able-bodied man in the United States should be required to perform one year's continuous military service before attaining the age of twenty-five years. It is a vital question, one of the most vital that this nation faces to-day, for, much as we may deplore the fact, the thunder and crash of struggling armies which reaches across the water from time to time, proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the age of war is not over and that world peace is but an illusionary fancy. We of the affirmative, as much as any one, deplore the fact. Yet we see that we must adjust our military policy to meet the new conditions which confront us. It is with this purpose in view that we discuss this question to-night. We recognize that any suggestion of compulsory military service is distasteful to the average American audience, but the peace which we now enjoy

will not be perpetual unless we take steps to make it so. The man who neglects the safety of his nation in peace is as much a traitor as the one who refuses to guard its safety in time of war.

In maintaining the negative of this proposition, our opponents would perhaps have us rely on arbitration or on our treaty relations. This is manifestly illogical. Century after century, unseen and undreamed of at first, the converging lines of national growth and welfare of two nations approach each other. When they meet, war is the result. The arbitrationist seeks to step in at the point of contact and hold apart the converging lines. This cannot be done. Not until force is placed behind arbitration treaties will they become binding. Until the thief agrees to arbitrate with the man he is about to rob, until the murderer agrees to arbitrate with his victim, until human nature suffers some material change, arbitration must ever fail.

And what of the strength of our treaties? Time after time has Japan broken her treaty relations with China and Korea. Before our very eyes lies desolate Belgium, a terrible example to the unthinking. No stronger treaties could exist than those between her and Germany, and yet, when she deemed it expedient, Germany laid waste this fertile nation and referred to her violated treaty as "a mere scrap of paper." A mere scrap of paper indeed! When an enlightened and civilized nation refers to its solemn promises as mere scraps of paper, what are we to expect in the future regarding the strength of treaty relations?

Compulsory military service, the system which is being advocated to-night, has been known since feudal times. In its present form it started in Prussia in 1804. To-day it is practiced in France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Japan, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Australia, and, in fact, in every important nation on earth except England and the United States. Nor is it something new for this country, for Congress in 1792 passed a law compelling all able-bodied men to serve for a limited length of time, but the provisions of this bill have never been enforced.

In taking up the question, we find some terms that need definition. By able-bodied, we mean all men who are physically fit to serve in the army. The term military service includes any branch of our military work, whether in the army or navy. By agreement one year's military service is taken to include three months actual field work with the colors and at least three hours per day of active drill for the other nine months, the rest of the time of these nine months to be spent as the authorities think best.

We of the affirmative, then, believe, that the truth or falsity of this proposition rests on three main issues. First, that there is need for further military preparation because there is more than a remote possibility of war and because present means of meeting this need are totally inadequate. Second, we shall convince you that the system which we advocate will fill this need. And last, it is our purpose to show you that even were we never to have war, the time and money spent in our

system, far from being lost, would prove a productive expenditure to the nation.

First among our needs for military preparation, is the upholding of the Monroe Doctrine, upon whose maintenance depends our only hope of national existence. And yet, it is a veritable challenge to the world, meaningless unless we have the power to uphold it, and destined to speedy and certain downfall. When we can no longer uphold the Monroe Doctrine, our hopes for the United States of America as a future world power fade swiftly to naught.

Much as has been said to the contrary, to the rational and thinking citizen there cannot be the slightest doubt that Japan is to-day a menace to our national existence. In order to escape ultimate destruction, Japan must control the Pacific, that same Pacific which comprises thirty-four per cent. of the earth's surface and in the countries bordering upon whose waters are to be found one-half the population and two-thirds of the unexploited lands of the globe. Step by step she has eliminated China and Russia from this control and the United States alone remains.

We of the Western World can not judge the Japs by our own standards. We are a race of commercialists, they of warriors. Our standards are Christian, theirs pagan; our civilization modern, theirs age-old and oriental. No commercial or economic ties bind their people and ours together. We are two separate and alien races.

The territorial possessions of any nation, it is said,

are provocative of war when they possess a positive valuation to some other nation, commercially, strategically, or racially. Our possessions are no exception to the rule. The Philippines hold this valuation to Japan because they command every trade route to the Orient and would provide Japan with a ready outlet for her surplus population.

As regards Hawaii, Japan protested when we annexed the island and stated that she would not then or thereafter consent to our holding it. This protest has never been withdrawn. Do you know that Japan has been colonizing Hawaii with veterans of the Russo-Japanese War until they number over 60,000, or more than twice the mobile army of the United States? Hawaii with its immense strategical importance and its valuable coaling stations would fall the moment war was declared, for we have garrisoned it with a paltry battalion of 209 men, less than one three hundredth of the Japanese force. Alaska, too, considered by military experts to be the key to the Pacific, we have left totally unprotected, and Guam stands like a challenge in the very teeth of Japan. Meanwhile we go blithely ahead, expecting these places to defend themselves.

Bitter as it may be to our national pride, Japan is our superior militarily, for, with two-thirds of our population, she has forty-fold our military strength and preparation, and with her admirable transport system, she can land 200,000 men on our Pacific coast in from twenty-seven to thirty days. On the sea she has thirty per cent. more big guns than we, those same big guns,

which, so the Russian Admiral tells us, wiped the Russian fleet from the sea in three hours at the battle of Tsu-Shima. She is far our superior in armored cruisers, torpedo-boats, and destroyers, and turns out each year five dreadnaughts to our three.

More serious still, one-seventh to one-ninth of the males of military age in our Pacific Coast States, are Japs. To make the situation worse, our discriminations against the Japanese in the Pacific States give Japan a plausible reason for declaring war any time that she so desires. Steadfastly year by year, the American people refuse to believe that any dangers threaten them. Meanwhile Japan looks out from the exotic beauty of her flowery kingdom and smiles with age-old oriental cunning at our child-like credulity.

Other causes, too, are likely to involve us in war. Unwise legislation against aliens, intervention in Mexico, the rise of some now insignificant nations, or the protection of neutral trade in the present European War. Indeed, causes of war spring up all too quickly in the pathway of the unwary nation.

Perhaps my opponents will tell you that our isolation will protect us, but this is obviously untrue. Modern invention has decreased distances forty-fold. Times have changed since the days when tiny, ill-guided, wind-driven barks tossed perilously for months at a time across the dreary wastes of water, wholly at the mercy of the elements. To-day, mighty monsters of steel cleave their way across those same wastes of water, unerringly and unafraid. Europe is only six days distant, and the base

of supplies of a European nation is much closer in point of time than was that of Grant's army before Richmond in the Civil War.

Among the world powers of to-day, the United States holds a unique position on account of her youth. Behind us, fast falling into decay, lie the wrecks of fallen empires whose names once shook the world. Viewed with the calm judgment which only succeeding generations can exercise, certain truths become apparent which apply as much to-day as they did five thousand years ago.

National existence is not a haphazard freak of chance, but is governed by certain immutable laws, equally as much to-day as in the past. The mobile armies of war-like nations have never been beaten by the volunteer or popular uprisings of a military decadent nation. And what of our wealth? Opulence, far from being a defense, has caused the downfall of almost every important nation in the world's history. Perhaps our opponents will tell you that the cost of the proposed system will be prohibitive. Have we fallen so low as to reduce our national existence to the sordid basis of dollars and cents? The wealth of a nation, unlike that of an individual, depends not so much on the amount of its coinage as upon what stands behind that coinage.

Mighty empires have waxed and waned. Hearth-stone and altar, palace and senate-chamber now crumble to dust. Stilled as their lives may be, mute tongues of warning assail us. Our immigration has increased until almost one-half of our population is foreign born. No nation of antiquity ever faced such race problems as

we do, no nation of antiquity ever tried to bind together such a diverse population as we. Let us profit by the examples of the past.

We have viewed this question so far to-night from the present day standpoint. Let us take a look into the future. Far to our southward lies the mighty bulk of South America, comprising one-half of the unexploited territory of the globe and amply able to support three times the empires now quarreling over Europe. Its fertile land, its undeveloped resources cannot but seem a prize worth almost any cost to Europe, whose teeming restless millions occupy only one-twelfth of the earth's habitable lands, lands that have been hewn over and delved in for the last two thousand years, or to Japan and Korea, which together only constitute one two hundred and fiftieth of the earth's lands. Is it rational in the face of these facts, to believe that the United States without armies and navies to protect even her own borders, can expect to dominate one-fourth of the earth's habitable lands over which she has seen fit to claim dominion? It is not that we are not brave enough, but we have failed thus far to realize the somber facts. Europe with 350,000,000 has pushed as far as she can to the west; Asia with her 800,000,000 has pushed east until she can go no further. America, midway between, will be the meeting place of East and West. Here will be fought the gigantic struggles to determine which race shall dominate the earth, Caucasian or Oriental. Our hearts, our every interest, should be for the preserva-

tion of the white race for whose perpetuation it is the bounden and honorable duty of every red-blooded American citizen to prepare.

And now let us consider the last point in our need of military preparation. We have but recently finished the Panama Canal, the greatest waterway of its kind in the world, a feat of which this nation can be justly proud. But the fact that we have built it is no sign that we can hold it. France built the Suez Canal, but England owns it to-day. "The Panama Canal," says that world famous military expert, Homer Lee, "is to-day a vital point in the world's strategic bases." It is the key of the foreign defenses of the United States. If taken, the United States is separated from South America, the Monroe Doctrine nullified, and our Atlantic and Pacific squadrons, cut off from each other, lie at the mercy of a hostile fleet. Lastly, it controls the Caribbean Sea, which military experts consider as second only to the Mediterranean in strategical importance. Thus, we see, the Panama Canal is of prime world importance strategically and commercially, and that it is of utmost importance that we guard it religiously in the years to come, so that it may ever stand as a mighty bulwark between us and disaster.

I have shown that the age of world war is not over, that there is a strong probability of this nation becoming involved in war. Perhaps you are thinking that these things may all be true, but that our present army and navy can take care of the need. It is my purpose

in the short time remaining to give you some analysis of our present military policy and the forces with which we would have to meet these exigencies.

First, let us see how many men we need. The figures that I give you to-night are those of the highest authorities on this subject, the Secretary of War, Chief of Staff Wotherspoon, Major General Leonard A. Wood, and their colleagues. The following taken from the report of the general staff on the organization of the land forces, is the latest and most authoritative statement obtainable. "At the outbreak of war with a first class nation, it would be absolutely necessary to place in the field 460,000 mobile troops and 42,000 coast artillery, and be able to raise 300,000 more troops immediately."

We now have 7,806 coast artillery, and 30,500 mobile troops, which is one-seventh enough coast artillery and one-fifteenth enough mobile troops for even the first call to arms. We must have a trained citizen soldiery to depend upon. Furthermore, in these days of triple alliances, we might be attacked by more than one enemy at once and in far divergent places. In addition to these troops for home defense, there are needed, according to the general staff, at least 138,000 men in our foreign possessions. It is of paramount importance that we defend Panama, Hawaii, and the Philippines, for upon their sovereignty depends the maintenance of those coaling stations so necessary to our sea defenses. When our battleship squadron made its trip of the Pacific several years ago, hired colliers, flying foreign flags, had to

accompany them. What would we do in time of war? Half of our dreadnaughts would rot at the wharves for lack of coaling stations.

Our needs, then, are briefly these. Beside the men to fill the navy and noncombatant branches of our army, we must have 940,000 men, 640,000 of whom must be on hand at all times and 300,000 within immediate call. Thus, since the system which we advocate gives but 650,000, it is not revolutionary and provides us with an army of about the right size. As regards the 300,000 reserves, the United States has now the mighty sum of eight reserves, a monument to our inefficient and short-sighted military policy.

We have before us the testimony of authority regarding what forces are absolutely necessary for our safety. Let us now briefly analyze our present facilities for meeting these needs. If we are up to this standard, we need go no further. If we are deficient, we most certainly wish to know it, that we may remedy the defect.

The mobile army of the United States is at present barely twice the size of the New York police force, there being only about 26,000 regulars available at any time. Do you consider that an adequate protection for this nation, 25,000 to guard 100,000,000? Our army is almost the same size as before the Civil War, and hardly as large as when this state was admitted to the union. It is now run on the same principles that were discarded by European nations fifty years ago. "To grow is to change; to be perfect, is to have changed many times."

What now of our militia? Last year only one-half

the paper strength of the militia appeared for drill and one-half of these were unarmed. What can be expected of such an organization? George Washington told the whole story 125 years ago in a letter to Congress: "Regular troops alone are equal to the exigencies of modern war. The firmness requisite for the real business of fighting is only to be attained by a constant course of discipline and service. No militia will ever acquire the habits necessary to resist a regular force, and he who depends upon them is resting upon a broken staff. It is most earnestly to be wished that the liberties of America may no longer be trusted to any material degree to such precarious dependence."

Henry J. Stimson, former secretary of war, has summarized the situation thus: "In case of need, if we take the militia at its full paper strength, which is manifestly absurd, we could raise 148,000 men at the end of six months." One hundred and forty-eight thousand men, an enormous army indeed, when compared with the million and a half that Germany debouched upon the French frontier in seven days. Germany, France, or Japan can any one of them place more trained men under skilled officers on our shores in one month than we can raise in a year.

I wish I had time to tell you of our deficiencies in coast defense, artillery, and transportation facilities. Franklin D. Roosevelt, assistant secretary of navy, says that our navy is 18,000 men short, besides those needed to man the dreadnaughts, cruisers, and submarines now

under construction. Thousands of our yearly recruits must be used here.

Perhaps our opponents will tell you that we will have little to fear from the European nations after the war. This is manifestly untrue, for the nation that wins will have an army of trained and seasoned veterans and corps of officers unsurpassed in practical experience and knowledge of military life. As the *New York Times* puts it: "Congress expects the European War to give us a breathing spell in which to prepare. In that remark lies the history of our unpreparedness from 1812 to the present day. Congress has always depended upon a breathing spell in which to prepare, and spends it in breathing, not preparing. Congress is good at breathing."

It has been the policy of this nation in the past to depend upon untrained, volunteer troops and officers in war. Let us see what has been the result. The Revolution was prolonged seven years because of the short term enlistments and bickering among troops. In the War of 1812, 5,000 British regulars routed forty times their own strength of our volunteers and militia, and burned our national capital, a fact which is still a disgrace to our national honor. In the Civil War more officers were dishonorably dismissed, than were killed by bullet and disease. Four times as many men were lost by desertion as by bullet. In the Spanish-American War, we lost as many by preventable disease as the Japs lost in the Russo-Japanese War. These, in brief, are some of

the results of depending on volunteer officers and men, a thing our system aims to do away with.

I have shown you the all too numerous causes which might easily involve us in war. I have laid open to you the miserably inadequate preparation which our present military policy provides to meet this need. The time has come when the Americans must awake from their dreams of safety and prepare to defend the country which we love so well. My colleague will show you that the system which we advocate will meet this need better than any other. Viewed in this light, what truly patriotic American will begrudge one year to his country?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, MISS MARY SCHOFIELD, COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '18

Ladies and Gentlemen: My colleague has shown you that the days of warfare are not yet over, that we as a nation must be prepared to defend ourselves, and although world peace is greatly to be desired, we can not fail to recognize that the time for disarmament is not yet here. Furthermore, he has shown you that the present military system of the United States is inadequate, that it utterly fails to meet the needs of our nation for defense and does not provide an adequate standing army. A foreign nation might gain a foothold in our country despite the efforts of our few mobile troops. Once they did it would require a great unnecessary loss of life and property to drive out the invaders. In case of a great war, we would have to place volunteers in the field.

These raw recruits would not be efficient soldiers, for American citizens must have some training in times of peace, if they are to be at all effective in times of war.

Having, therefore, shown the need for defense and the inadequacy of our present army, we advocate a new system, a system by which every able-bodied man will receive one year's military training before he is twenty-five years of age, a system which, we believe, will fill our need for defense and prove a benefit to both nation and individual.

The first and most important question in consideration of this new plan is that of defense. Will it fill our military needs? Will it remedy the weaknesses of our present system? Will it provide adequate means for defense?

Before these questions can be answered, we must determine as accurately as possible the size and efficiency of the army such a system would yield. The census reports give the number of males between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, but there are no figures of the percentage of physically disqualified in any of our national records of statistics. A more accurate and definite estimate is based upon the number trained under a similar system. Take Germany, for example. The health conditions in Germany are similar to those in our own nation and the proportion which would be physically disqualified is, therefore, nearly the same. Germany maintains an army of 870,000 men. These men serve for two years. Were they to serve for only one year, there would be only half as many, or 435,000. The popula-

tion of Germany is 66,000,000. That of the United States half again as large. Our nation would, under a similar system, train half as many more per year as Germany, or 650,000.

This number would include all men stationed at the coastal defenses, noncombatant men, and those enrolled in the navy. It does not, however, include the defenses of our foreign possessions. My colleague has shown that it would require 138,000 men to defend these. For these defenses we would have to have long term enlistment men, similar to those in our army to-day, as it would cost too much to transport the short term men back and forth.

The officers for such a system would receive their training at West Point, the army schools, or from a three to five-year enlistment. Under this system we would have within our own borders and not including the defenses of our foreign possessions, a mobile army of troops, coast defense forces, and navy, of 650,000.

After one year's service these men would leave the army and take up their regular business, but they would take with them enough military training to make them ready for quick mobilization as reserves in case of war. The men in the regular army would be stationed at the forts, ready for instant call. They would be in daily service and drill. At the outbreak of war the average training of the men in the mobile army would be six months. In the great conflicts of the past, the United States has converted new recruits into effectual troops in six months and done this when the standard of the offi-

cers was far lower than it would be under this system. Why then would not the men under such a system, led by trained officers, and in actual service, be thoroughly efficient at the end of their training?

Should the United States be plunged into a great war, how would this army defend the nation? My colleague has taken the estimates of the best military authorities of to-day and shown you that for adequate defense we need a mobile army of 450,000 men, a force of 50,000 men for coastal defenses, and a naval force of 150,000, a force of 138,000 for foreign defenses, and a reserve force of at least 300,000. All of these troops to be officered by well-trained men.

Compare the army which compulsory military service would raise with the estimated need. It provides the mobile force of 450,000 men, the coastal defense of 50,000, and the navy force of 150,000. For foreign protection the trained troops are provided. The system would yield well-trained officers for all of these troops. Should war break out and be prolonged, reinforcements would be needed. These could be provided for from our citizenry, for every able-bodied male would have had enough military training to make him an efficient reserve. Although these men would have been out of training for some years, perhaps, a few weeks' drill would revive the military discipline and knowledge and convert them into an active, trained, mobile army of whatever strength necessary. Thus the necessary reserve force is provided for. The proposed system would soon render every able-bodied man in the United States

fit for service in the army. It, therefore, meets the requirements of every branch of national defense.

The second question for consideration is whether compulsory military service would be a wise policy for our nation from an economic standpoint. Would the additional expenses be justified? We of the affirmative admit that such a system would greatly increase our national expenditures, but we contend that the benefits to the nation and to the individual are more than sufficient to justify the expenditure.

It is difficult to estimate the cost of such a system, a system so much larger than our present one. It is a well established fact that as any institution enlarges, the cost per capita is decreased. As to how much this cost would be decreased we must turn to our present military authorities. Two of the most prominent of these are Generals Wood and Wotherspoon, both ex-chiefs of staff. They have made a careful study of military conditions for years and they agree with other leading military men that such a system would cost less than \$1000 per man. The present cost per man in our army is almost \$1500. Germany keeps her army at a cost of less than \$400 per man. To maintain our army of 650,000 home troops and our foreign forces would mean the support of between 750,000 and 800,000 men, or a total annual expenditure of \$750,000,000 to \$800,000,000. This is a large sum, but the protection of our nation alone justifies its expenditure.

There is no surer way to prevent war than to have ready sufficient means to prevent invasion. We are a

peaceful nation and do not want a conflict. Strife need not arise unless the aggression start with a foreign power. If that power knows our means of protection are weak, it will not long deliberate, but make haste to strike before we can prepare ourselves. If, on the other hand, that power realizes that our forces are able to repel invasion, it will certainly be slow to start a conflict. At present our military system is ridiculed by all the great powers. But were the system of compulsory military service installed, it would leave us with military forces that would command the respect of all nations.

We further admit that the installation of such a system would occasion great expenses, but the cost of one great war would be more than enough to cover the initial costs and maintain the system for years. The British Parliament has already voted over three billions of dollars for the present war, and England's expenses have certainly not been as heavy as those of the Continental nations within whose territories the struggle is being waged. Compulsory military service does not absolutely guarantee us against war. No system does. But compulsory military service gives us protection in case war ever does arise. Fire insurance does not prevent fires, yet it is certainly a handy thing to have in case fire ever does happen. Do we question the justifiability of paying for fire insurance?

We have shown you that such a system provides adequate military protection and that from that standpoint alone, the expense is justifiable. Now we wish to show you that if we were never to have war the peaceful

products of such a system would make it a productive expenditure to both the nation and the individual. We wish to show that it would strengthen the individual morally and physically, that it would foster patriotism and would be of great educational and commercial value.

The habits of punctuality, of obedience, of discipline, and the instinct of honor inculcated in the people of Germany by a similar system, the meeting of all classes on one common ground of duty, have physically and morally strengthened the whole German people. Can we not hope for the same results in this nation?

There can be no doubt as to the physical value of such a system. Men are more and more confining themselves to indoor life and as our population increases, this condition will increase. The benefits of one year's outdoor physical training will be invaluable to these men. It would be of great benefit even to those who came from the farm to learn the military carriage and have a year's drill. German statisticians agree that the average life of a man in Germany is prolonged five years by military drill. In addition the average man is more capable, better trained, and more nearly perfect physically. If such a system would prove of such moral and physical value to the individual of which the nation is made up, it could not but strengthen the nation. These benefits are too great to be lightly overlooked.

Military service engenders a spirit of loyalty, builds up patriotism and produces a spirit of obedience to law. One of the major generals of our army recently said: "There can be no doubt that the adoption of state laws

requiring instruction in duties of citizenship coupled with service in the national guards for at least one year before exercising the right to vote, would in a few years qualify the rising generations to better comprehend and rightly value the generous liberty vouchsafed to them by the republic."

From a military standpoint we are at peace with the world, but from a commercial standpoint we are engaged in the bitterest kind of warfare. Already Europe has a larger population than the country will support. She must exchange her manufactured products for food stuffs raised in less densely populated countries. The same is beginning to be true of the United States. Last year our importations of food stuffs exceeded our exportations by \$75,000,000. Our population is getting so large that we must depend upon some of the world's commerce to support it. Yet at the present time all, or practically all, of the world's commerce is handled by England, Germany, and France.

In the competition for the markets of South America and the Orient we have failed to hold our place with these nations. They are older, have a lower standard of living, and can produce things cheaper than we can. If we hope to cope with them successfully, we must increase our economic ability as a nation. Germany has done this through her system of industrial schools. Her progress commercially runs parallel with her progress in industrial education. If we as a nation are to increase our economic ability and become a great factor in the world's commerce, the industrial efficiency of the

individual citizen must be increased. How can this great task be accomplished? We know of no better way than through the compulsory military system.

Obviously a man can not drill all the time. The statement of the question only calls for three hours per day for nine months. What would be done with the remainder of the time? Idleness is the great curse of our present system and must be guarded against. The men must have some profitable occupation for their spare time and how could they spend it better than in obtaining some sort of industrial education? The teachers would be chosen from among the officers. This is done in our forts to-day, where the government is now giving instruction to the men along a great number of lines. The installation of such a system would require some little equipment, but such equipment could be installed when the barracks were built. The men would be there and their support provided for. The educational expense would therefore be small and unimportant.

Here, roughly, is a plan for industrial education that could be carried out with compulsory military service. The men who come into the service would fall into three general classes, namely, men with little or no education, men with a common grade school education, and those with a secondary or high school education. College men would receive their military education at college. For the first class there would be schools in forge work, carpentering, mechanics, baking, etc. The army itself has need of men trained along these lines in time of war, and if there is no war, the individual will have a start to-

wards developing a trade for himself when he leaves the army. For the second class there would be work in sanitation, surveying, business methods, stenography, etc. All of these things would prove valuable to the army in times of war and to the individual in times of peace. For the third class there would be work in electrical engineering, construction, business management, etc. We do not propose to give a man a college education and make him a trained soldier in a year. The military training should come first. But we can give him all the military education he can assimilate and at the same time give him industrial education that would be of great use to him in the business world. Our idea is not to make an army of blacksmiths and bakers and clerks. Our first aim is to make these men efficient soldiers, but a man is no less efficient as a soldier because he knows the principles of sanitation and how to operate a field telephone.

At the end of a year's service the men would be returned to the industrial world having received a start towards the development of a definite trade. The great industrial demand of our nation is for specialized training. Too many men enter the business world with no definite idea of what they want to do. As a result most of them become day laborers wandering from job to job and working a maximum time at a minimum price. Many of them are thrown out of work and become tramps. Thousands of men are to-day without employment. Why? Because they have no special ability along any line and are not wanted. There are many

men in our nation whose financial condition prohibits training in an industrial school. Most of these men would be only too glad of a chance to obtain definite instruction in some trade or profession. Thousands of poor fathers would welcome the army school for the education it provided for their children who would otherwise have to enter the world of business untrained. The army service would relieve the overcharged labor market and return a better economic unit. It would raise the working efficiency of a great class of individuals and in so doing would increase the industrial efficiency and economic ability of the whole nation. Such industrial education would be of two-fold value. It would make the individual count for more both to himself and to his country and it would increase the economic ability of the nation.

Friends, we have shown you the great need of our nation for defense and the uselessness of our present system. We have proposed a new plan to meet our military deficiencies, a plan of compulsory military service. We have shown that such a system will meet the needs for defense in that it provides forces which meet the estimated requirements of military men. We have shown that the defense provided justifies the expense of such a system. We have further shown that were there never to be war such a system would be of great benefit to the individual and nation in times of peace, that it would be of great moral and physical value, that it would foster a spirit of true patriotism, that it would increase the economic efficiency of the nation by training the

individual industrially. For these reasons we believe that the United States should require one year of military service from all able-bodied male citizens.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, MISS MARY SCHOFIELD,
COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: The negative, by proposing another system for strengthening our national defenses, have virtually admitted our first two points, namely, that we have need for military protection and that our present forces are inadequate. They can not deny the value of military training to the individual because they themselves are advocating placing more men in the army. The last issue then decides the debate. Our opponents by admitting our other contentions have made the debate hinge upon which of the two systems is preferable.

We hope to prove to you by their own authority, the war department, that their plan can not work. It can not be put into operation because, first, it depends upon voluntary enlistment. "Despite the allurements of lithographed posters and smartly uniformed officers outside the recruiting stations, the enlistments fall far short of the needs of even our small army." We have always been compelled to advertise to get enough men for our present small army and have never had it up to its full enlistment. How do our opponents expect to get recruits for an army two or three times as large?

As to their reserves, since 1912 we have had a reserve system in connection with the army which is essentially the same as the one which they are advocating, and ac-

cording to the report of the war department it has proved an utter failure. It has secured only sixteen reserves during its entire three years of existence. Moreover the present system of the war department is even superior to the plan they propose, in that it gives the reserve a choice as to three or four years on the reserves. Their system gives him no choice and instead of shortening the term of service increases it to five or seven years. And it is just this long reserve clause that the men object to. This is well shown by the following statement from the Inspector General in the *War Department Reports* in 1913: "Reports from various parts of the country show a marked decrease in the numbers of accepted applicants for enrollment. A number of causes have been suggested to account for this, chief among them is the seven year enlistment contract. The authorities have carefully explained to applicants the nature of service, both in regard to service with colors and in the reserves, but the men object to the reserve feature which places them under obligation for too long a time. Careful examination of 425 former soldiers eligible for enlistment in the reserves resulted in enlisting only three men." If the men object to placing themselves under liability of service for three or four years, will they, do you think, be better satisfied if we increase it to five and seven years? It is this reserve feature to which they object and which keeps them from joining in sufficient numbers to give us an adequate army. The only means for getting an army of sufficient size, 600,000, is by making military service compulsory.

Not only would we eliminate the difficulty and expense involved in recruiting, but under compulsory service we can give a man as much training in one year as is now given in two or three under our present voluntary system, the success of which depends upon the attractions of the service to compel men to join. Furthermore, we can train an equal sized army under a compulsory system for one-third of what a volunteer method would cost. This is not merely our own statement. Hear what the Encyclopedia Britannica says: "Fully three times as many men may be trained under compulsory service and in one-half the time as under any known voluntary system, which must depend for its recruits upon the attractions of the service."

Furthermore, compulsory military service places the burdens of national protection equally upon all. It avoids maintaining a professional army, which is always a serious political menace and desirous of war.

Let us now see where the debate stands. We have established our first two contentions, that there is danger that the United States may be involved in war and that our present military resources are insufficient to afford us adequate protection. We have shown you by the reports of the War Department, from which the plan they are advocating is taken, that their plan can not work, that they can not get enough men by voluntary enlistment to get an army of the size they propose, that the applicants object to the reserve feature, that the war department has only succeeded in enrolling sixteen reserves in three years. How would they ever get the

300,000 they speak about? Their plan has not worked and can not work. Therefore, we must take the only method left, which is compulsory military service.

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, R. BRUCE MCKEOWN,
COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE**

Ladies and Gentlemen: All through this debate our opponents have been parading the fact that they are presenting a scheme that has the authority of the war department behind it and comes from the report of that department. Yet when we show by that same report that the cold facts of history show that their plan is impracticable, they scoff at our authority. Surely if they can use the records of the war department as a weapon against us, those same records are equally as effective a weapon in our hands, and are not to be decried.

As for the un-American aspect of this question of which our opponents have made so much, why is anything un-American which safeguards our nation? True patriotism consists not so much in praising the flag as in preparing oneself to defend the principles for which that flag stands. Why is compulsory military service any more un-American than our compulsory pure-food, sanitation, and health laws, than our compulsory taxes, compulsory education, or compulsory child labor laws? Like these it is compulsory only because it tends to safeguard our nation and our homes.

But besides this the President already has vested in him the power to call the men of this country at any

time. This was done during the Civil War. Did we call this un-American? Compulsory service is merely an outgrowth of the President's right.

Another point of which our opponents make much, is that the United States, as the greatest exponent of arbitration and peace, would place herself in a bad position in the eyes of the world by preparing to defend herself, and by adopting compulsory military service. But this contention is illogical. Because we prepare to defend ourselves is no sign that we wish war. Weakness and unpreparedness are the things which invite war, for no nation will attack another unless it has hopes of success.

Furthermore, in the light of recent events, world authorities daily agree more fully, that until force is placed behind arbitration treaties, the latter will never prove binding. If every nation on earth were to disarm simultaneously, all would be well. But since this is not possible, it is imperative for the interests of world peace, that the United States prepare to back her arbitration treaties.

To say that because we prepare to defend ourselves is a sign that we invite war is ridiculous and illogical. Because we have a fire department, do we invite fire? Because we maintain a police force, do we invite crime? Certainly not. To prepare to defend oneself against danger is merely the part of discretion.

Our opponents have charged that the system proposed would not be efficient and would not turn out the proper sort of soldiers. Yet Germany considers one year sufficient in some cases. The Chief of Staff of the United

States army states clearly, in the *War Department Report* for 1913, that one year is sufficient time to train a soldier, even under our present system, which every one admits is inefficient. At the present the men spend a large amount of time in the barracks, washing dishes, digging ditches, sometimes even hauling slop or mowing lawns. If the Chief of Staff considers one year sufficient for the training of a soldier under the present system, surely it could be accomplished in one year under the intensive training of compulsory military service.

There is nothing in this question which precludes an increase in our navy. A large navy we must undoubtedly have for the protection of our insular possessions and to guard our shore line, but a navy may be scattered by storms and the marvelous efficiency of the submarine makes the large battleships a rather uncertain defense. We must have an army of trained men to defend our shores in case the navy fails.

Our opponents have dwelt at some length on the cost entailed by this system. We admit that it will cost a rather large sum, but a war coming on us unprepared, as our opponents admit is possible, would cost far more in the first few months, both in blood and treasure. Nothing is cheap which is adequate, and my colleague has proved to you that the system which we now have and the one which they have proposed to you are both inadequate. The money spent in this way acts merely as national insurance and is the cheapest of rates.

Although the expense is rather large, it is as nothing compared with the money we spend for other things.

This nation spends more each year for amusements and luxuries than any other nation on the globe. Last year we consumed two and one-third billion gallons of liquor, costing four billion dollars. This sum alone would finance four systems such as we propose. In New York City alone \$250,000,000 worth of automobiles were sold in 1912, to say nothing of the up-keep of these cars. This was only in one city. One-tenth of the people in the country are engaged in amusing the other nine-tenths. We spend yearly over \$900,000,000 on motion pictures, to say nothing of the theater and base ball parks. Surely, if we as a nation can afford this much for luxuries, we can spend a small part of this sum for our national safety.

In conclusion, therefore, since the negative have admitted that there is imminent danger of war, that our present means of meeting this danger is totally inadequate; since my colleague has shown you that the system which they propose fails to meet this need, and since we have shown you that our system does meet this need, is not un-American, is efficient, and will not cost exorbitantly, we of the affirmative believe that we have proved to you "that every able-bodied man should be required to perform one year of continuous military service before attaining the age of twenty-five years."

*COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE vs.
OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE*

FIRST NEGATIVE, RAYMOND MILLER, COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17

Ladies and Gentlemen: The statement of the question and the definition of its terms are before you. In taking up the negative side of it, we shall endeavor to prove to you, first, that compulsory military service is un-American; second, that its cost is prohibitive; third, that the system does not afford us adequate military protection, and fourth, that there is a more efficient and cheaper system that is not open to any of the above objections.

Referring to our first point, we maintain that compulsory military service is un-American in principle and contrary to the very fundamental doctrines upon which this democracy was founded and has been maintained. The exact date of the origin of compulsory military service is not known, but it dates back to the time when the vassal served his lord during the feudalistic period, and the lord, in turn, was compelled to fight for his king. From some such origin has developed the great national systems of compulsory military service that we have among the nations of Europe to-day. It grows best in the most despotic nations. It was early abandoned by England. Our forefathers came to this country for the express purpose of freedom. Since that time we have

never once thought of erecting above us a government that shall be as bad as the despotism from which we fled.

We freely admit that there is need of military preparation in the United States. The present European conflict has brought that fact before us and all military experts and statesmen agree on that point. But the question under discussion is how shall we go about that preparation? Shall we throw aside all our national ideals of freedom to gain it?

We object to national defense by compulsory service because it is contrary to the principles of this nation arbitrarily to demand a year, and one of the most important years, from the lives of each of its citizens. Our nation has always depended upon voluntary service. As long as our government is worthy of our respect it can continue to depend upon voluntary support. When it ceases to be worthy of our support, then even compulsory service can not long maintain it.

We object to compulsory military service because we have no hereditary enemies. Where a nation has, where it depends upon the rising generations to avenge the wrongs suffered by previous generations, where it must educate its youth to hate their neighbors, as is the case in Germany and France, such a system is a useful instrument. To-day in Germany there is a great demand for the "God punish England" mottoes. But in America we do not teach our children to pray in hate and petition revenge for human injuries from a divine father. We are at peace with all nations and cherish malice towards

none. In the words of President Wilson, we do not covet anything that belongs to another nation. Under such conditions, is it necessary that we make a trained soldier out of every man who is capable of bearing arms? If the purpose is only to be able to defend ourselves, must we turn every peaceful village into an armed camp?

We say that compulsory military service is un-American because America has taken the lead in the movement for world peace. To initiate any such system at the present time would be to give up that position of influence of which we are so proud. It would place us by the side of Germany, Russia, and Japan, and the other militaristic nations. It would be hypocrisy for us to ask other nations to disarm and hail the dawn of universal peace, while we endeavor to make every man a soldier and claim it is only to be able to protect ourselves. No nation can object to our maintaining a force sufficient to insure our independence, but no nation will agree that the only way to do that is to train every man for war.

We maintain that compulsory military service is un-American because it breeds suspicion. At present all nations trust us. If we create here a great military system, other nations will suspect and rightly so, that this huge weapon of defense may suddenly be converted into a weapon of offense. A huge increase in our army will create enough Latin-American suspicion to make it imperative that we further strengthen our means of defense. Every time we launch a new man-of-war, England and Germany will launch another to protect them-

selves, and we shall be compelled to build another to protect ourselves from theirs. And so it goes.

On our north is an invisible line four thousand miles in length that separates our territories from those of Canada. There is not a fort along it, and yet so well have we defended it that a century of peace has marked the relations of the two peoples that border on it. How better can we continue to guard that line and protect our shipping on the Great Lakes than we have in the past. If we construct forts and station armies along it to defend ourselves from Canadian aggression, Canada must do the same to protect herself from American aggression. The friendly, open-handed relations between the two nations would then end to be followed by a suspicious truce where each nation would jealously watch every movement of the other. If we are to continue to receive the good will of all nations, we can not adopt any such system of compulsory military service.

We maintain that compulsory military service is un-American because it would make those compelled to serve against their will hostile to the government. They would be half-hearted, rebellious inclined men. The criminal who is punished by the law for his misdeeds feels hostile to the law. How much more so must he feel who for no wrong act is compelled to give up a year to his government against his will. To be able to enforce such a law we should have to establish a system of passports, such as are employed in the nations of Europe. We should have to keep track of every individual and know where he was at all times. A man

could not take a business trip without securing a passport from the police officers. Do you think the American people would submit to such a system? Yet unless we did employ some such system a man would be able to escape his year's military service by moving about the country.

It is un-American lastly because it tends to make the people militaristic. Our people are a peace-loving people, but a nation of warriors would want war. Can you teach a girl to dance, and expect her not to desire to dance? Can you teach a man to play baseball, and expect him not to desire to play baseball? Can you perfect a man in any art and then expect him not to desire to use the knowledge and power he has gained? Can you make a soldier out of every male citizen, and then expect our nation not to feel inclined to use its military strength when the occasion is offered? We say that compulsory military service is un-American because it would change us from a peaceful nation to one ambitious along military lines.

Secondly, we object to compulsory military service because of its enormous cost. We have been known as a nation with a small army, and yet since our nation came into existence, half of our governmental expenditures have gone for military purposes. Increase our army many fold and how would we raise enough governmental revenues to pay the costs?

It is hard to estimate what such a system would cost. The best we can do is to judge the future by the past and turn to the cost figures of our present army. At

present we have a standing army of 90,000 men which costs us annually \$132,000,000. This makes each soldier cost us \$1470 per year. Under compulsory military service we would have an army of at least 700,000 men. Suppose that we could reduce the cost to \$1000 per man, which is doubtful, and our system would cost us \$700,000,000 per year, a sum equal to more than half our present governmental revenue. Barracks would have to be provided for these men. According to the war college, the cheapest habitations that we have ever built for our present army costs \$1175 per man. We already have barracks for 100,000. We would have to build barracks for 600,000 more, which would cost in the neighborhood of \$700,000,000 more, making a total \$1,400,000,000, which is more than our total national revenues at the present time. We call attention to the fact that this is what such a system would cost at the cheapest possible estimates. If we use the present cost figures of the army as a basis to figure from, the system would cost almost \$2,000,000,000. As revenues and tariffs are now at a maximum, we would have to raise the \$1,400,000,000 necessary to run their system of compulsory military service by direct taxation, making a direct tax of \$14 per year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. But as this would necessarily be paid by the taxpayer, it leaves an average burden of \$140 for the first year on every taxpayer in our nation and \$70 for each year thereafter, which sum will tend to increase as time goes on and more expensive equipment is required.

Besides all this vast expense for the upkeep of an enormous army, in order to provide adequate protection, we must strengthen our fortifications and maintain a large navy. Added to this we must maintain post armories, for after a few years, according to our opponents' plan, we will have a reserve running into the millions. In order for these men to be of any use they must have equipment, such as arms, artillery, horses, etc. Since the mad craze of militarism is upon the world, at the end of five or ten years this equipment will be out of date and will have to be exchanged for more modern. In fact, it is impossible to say where this mad race would end or how much this enormous expense would consume.

If this enormous expenditure were an absolute insurance against war, if by paying this tribute annually, we would be forever free from the menace of war and its inevitable loss of life and money, we might consider it. But the present European war proves that military preparation alone does not prevent war.

We of the negative, then, maintain that compulsory military service is undemocratic and un-American in principle and that its cost is prohibitive. My colleague will further show the fallacy of the system, that it means an enormous expenditure without giving us adequate military protection, that it is not a good military policy, and that there is another plan which gives us better national defense and does not cost anything like the proposed system will cost.

In closing, I would like to ask the affirmative what influential men support their plan? Can you name a

single statesman, economist or military officer of any rank that is urging such a plan? The fact is, it is heartily denounced by President Wilson, by leading statesmen, and most important of all, by the military men themselves. They do not advocate any such military policy. What they do advocate is a reorganization of our present system into a larger and more efficient fighting force, as my colleague will show you.

For the United States to be swept from her moorings now on the foolish supposition of an attack by Germany, or Japan, or England, or any other nation, would be an act, not only of folly but of national suicide as well. We should destroy at once our opportunity for that moral and political leadership which the whole world is looking to us to take and act upon when the war comes to an end. Can the United States throw away this opportunity which fate and history are combining to offer? If we adopt the despotic system of compulsory military service, we at the same time throw away our opportunity for the moral leadership of the world.

We wish to be free. We wish our children to be free. We wish our nation to be free and to continue to build a great and beautiful temple of freedom to which the wise and the good of every nation will continue to repair, and towards which the stricken nations of Europe will turn for the friendly hand of helpfulness when the sun sets on yonder fields of carnage.

SECOND NEGATIVE, RALPH C. SMITH, COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, '17

Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have shown us that the day of world-wide peace is not yet here, that our nation might at any time become involved in war, and that such a war would find us unprepared, with a small and inadequate army, unable to defend our territories and to preserve our national honor and integrity. To meet these conditions our worthy opponents have proposed to give all our young men a year of continuous military service. Accepting at their face value, for the time being, all their alarms of war and cries of unpreparedness, let us judge their system by the standards they themselves have set and see if it meets the needs they have laid before us. To do this we must lay aside any prejudice or emotionalism, and in the light of our soberest reason judge these plans by their worth as a means of national protection. For the time being let us lay aside all other phases of this question and let this system stand or fall on its merits as a method of national defense, for the real purpose of any military policy must be the defense of the nation, and if it fails in this, it fails completely.

We of the negative are opposed to this plan as a system of national defense, because we believe it fails in the very purpose for which it is intended. It does not give us adequate military preparation for four reasons.

First, the plan does not provide sufficient training to make a good soldier.

Second, too small a proportion can even approach field efficiency at any one time to give us a good army.

Third, it makes no provision for a well trained reserve.

Fourth, it does not provide for a permanent force, which we shall show you is absolutely necessary to our national defense.

Taking up the first point, we maintain that such a system does not make an efficient soldier because it is impossible to train one in a year. You may be able to teach a recruit the manual of arms and which end of the gun to shoot from in one year, but modern warfare consists in far more than this. In our army to-day the recruit is trained for three years before he is considered proficient. The heads of our army have opposed any attempts to cut down the enlistment period, because they maintain that shorter time would not provide for sufficient training. Let me read you in part the list of studies prescribed by the war department in which our soldiers must be proficient: "Drill and maneuvers by the individual, squads, companies, regiments; marksmanship; entrenching; marching under full equipment; swimming under full equipment; sword and bayonet practice," and many others, including the care of the health and sanitation of the camp, etc. Besides this it takes two or three years to instill into the men that discipline which alone will hold them together under fire and make them obey their officers, and without which any army becomes a disorganized mob at the critical time. At the present time England has a volunteer

army which she has been training for eight months at the rate of twelve and fourteen hours per day, and yet, even under the pressing demands of actual war, she hesitates to put these men in the field, because she does not consider them ready. Our worthy opponents have quoted Germany as an example of military efficiency. Surely this efficient military system would not keep its men in the army longer than is necessary to give a complete training, for this would only mean needless expense. What, then, is Germany's practice? At the present time they train their men for two years and have recently been trying to lengthen the time to three, because they have felt that two years was not long enough.

We have seen the military experts in the United States, England, and Germany agree that a long period of training is necessary, yet these gentlemen would have us adopt a system which trains men a few hours each day and calls them finished soldiers at the end of a year. Would this give us the national defense they tell us we need?

But even if a man were fully trained at the end of his year, only one-twelfth of those in the army could even approach field efficiency at any one time. I mean that each month they would only turn out one-twelfth of their men as having had in full the poor training that could be given by this system. The other eleven-twelfths would be raw recruits and partially trained men. How could any nation's army be efficient when less than ten per cent. of that army would be ready to take the field at any given time? Is this the force with

which they intend to repel the well trained armies which they tell us threaten our shores? Is this the force with which they propose to garrison our islands? One-twelfth of their army would be sixty or seventy thousand men, a number smaller than we have enlisted in our army to-day. Is this the way they propose to strengthen our national defenses?

In the third place, we maintain that their system fails to provide a proper reserve force. The question makes no provision for a reserve and there is none in their plan. The compulsory period is only for one year. In case of war we would need more men than were actually in the army at the time war was declared. Where would we turn for these additional forces? We have no method of compelling those who have served their term to reenlist. We would have to depend upon their volunteering, so that we are back again to a volunteer system, exactly where we started. All army units would have to be reorganized, for these men would have no definite place to report. It would amount to organizing a new army. It would require several months to retrain these men and develop under new officers the necessary order and discipline.

The gentlemen of the affirmative will probably have us believe that every American citizen who has been through their system will be ready to take the field as a finished soldier, thus supplying their reserves. But will he? He will have had no further training since his discharge from the army. He probably will not have fired a gun since he left. He may have been engaged in

indoor occupations. He will have had no discipline since he was in the ranks. Could this man step into the army and endure the physical hardships necessary to war? Could he shoot like a man who had been kept in training? Would he still retain his habits of discipline, without which an army is useless? His training has been like a half-learned lesson that is soon forgotten. To make a good reservist a man would have to be kept up to some degree of military proficiency. The finished product of the affirmative system would have to be re-trained for some months before he could take the field. Would an enemy courteously wait at our frontier for this training to take place?

Our final objection to this system is that it makes no provision for the defences of our outlying possessions and for manning our artillery and navy. In case of war our island possessions and the Panama Canal would be the object of the first attack, and these places must be securely protected. This protection would require highly trained men. Obviously, we cannot depend upon our one year enlistment for this service. We cannot send recruits out when they first enlist and if we wait until they are about to complete their military training, their stay would be so short that it would not be worth the time and money it would cost to send them forth. It takes three months to go to the Philippines and return. Nine months' training is a short training. They could stay about one week in the islands. To maintain 10,000 men there we *should* need 130,000 always on the way coming and going.

After all, the prime defense needed by this nation is naval rather than military. We have no dangerous opponents on this hemisphere and our position resembles that of an island power. An army is only needed to back up our navy and coast defences. We have no excuse for the great standing armies of Europe. What protection we need is from invasion from water rather than from land. This is so apparent that it needs no further discussion. But the affirmative plan would be worthless as far as the navy goes, for the need there is for ships rather than for men. But what men are needed must be highly proficient, men who make seafaring their profession. It takes many years to train an efficient gunner, a good engineer, or even an ordinary seaman. Would our opponents send our navy forth to battle manned by farmers for gunners and factory men as seamen? Surely they haven't forgotten what happened to the fleet Russia sent against Japan, manned by untrained sailors.

The artillery requires mechanics of special training. To operate our big guns demands as much skill as to run a locomotive. Does a railroad company put its engines in charge of apprentices? Very few men become engineers in less than five years. Can the government take any greater chance than a corporation?

So, friends, we see that such a system of compulsory military service would give us at best only a half-trained army, and only a small part of that army ready to take the field at any one time; it fails to give us a strong body of reserves; it does not provide for the defence

of our outlying possessions, which would be the objects of first attack by an enemy; and it does not provide highly trained men to man our navy and equip the big guns of our coast defences, which are useless without expert marksmen.

The gentlemen who favor this plan have made such a plea of the immediate possibility of war and our lack of adequate defences, that we must show them another system that is open to none of the objections of their plan and that will give an army that is truly efficient and yet cost but a small fraction of what their system would cost.

This is the plan that is proposed by General Wood, former chief of staff, and endorsed by his successor, General Wotherspoon. This plan is not mere jingoism as a result of the European war clouds. It is a plan conceived by military men to meet the military needs of the United States. It is a plan that was presented by the war department and printed in its report for 1914.

It is in brief this:

It recognizes that the first defences of the United States must be its navy and coast defence guns. But back of that we must have an army to complete the protection of our country in case our navy was defeated. These men who have been at the head of our military forces and are qualified to know what is needed, if any one is, estimate that we need to keep on hand an army of 200,000 men in active service and a reserve of 300,000 trained men who would report at once in case war was declared. To do this they advocate enlisting about

70,000 men each year. Instead of enlisting these men for the straight four-year term that is now in use, they will be enlisted for seven years. They will only be kept in the active army until they have become efficient soldiers, a time military authorities estimate will be between two and three years. As soon as they are considered proficient, they will be retired to the reserves to finish out their seven-year term. In the reserves they are allowed to do whatever they please, engage in any occupation and carry on the regular life of a civilian, except that at intervals of three months they must report by mail to the adjutant general. They will be paid some small wage while they continue as reservists, say one or two dollars a month, which they will receive as they report. At some time each year these men will be assembled at a definite time for ten days or two weeks for drill and practice. During this time all their expenses will be paid by the government. This would give us a well drilled, efficient army of 500,000 men, all we need for our own defence, according to the men who have been in charge of our national defences.

Now as to the cost of such a military organization. Again we turn to the statements of Generals Wood and Wotherspoon, who estimate that the expenses can be met without increasing our present appropriation, if we will abandon some of our numerous small posts and concentrate our army in a few large posts located at strategical points along our borders.

Now compare the two systems. Compulsory military service is not advocated by our military authorities.

The system we have been advocating is the one set forth by the War Department of the nation, and is taken from the 1914 report. Compulsory service will compel the government to support about 700,000 men. The plan of the war department will necessitate the government supporting only 200,000 men and paying a small fee to 300,000 more who are on the reserve list. Compulsory service gives an incomplete training and really has but a few thousand men ready for actual service. The volunteer and reserve system gives the full training advocated by our war department and always maintains an army of 500,000 men ready to take the field at any time. The conscript system would bankrupt our government. The volunteer system would not cost much more if any more than our present system. The drafted army is filled with many unwilling men while the other army is made up of volunteers who will stand the test in a crisis. It is a contrast between slaves and free men.

One other question remains to be answered. Could we get enough volunteers to maintain an army of the size we have outlined? Surely our own war department would not advocate the plan if there was any danger of failure from this source. In 1913 150,000 men applied, but there was room for only 30,000. Many recruiting offices were closed because the army needed no more men. This reserve system would not need half the applicants who sought admission last year, and if it should need more, it could easily secure them by increasing the recruiting stations.

But, friends, after all the prime defence needed by

this nation is naval rather than military. What we need to do is to increase our navy and keep it up to standard. Compulsory military service makes no provision for this and is a step in the wrong direction. An efficient navy backed by the army of 500,000 volunteers and reserves advocated by the war department would be enough permanently to insure our national integrity against any foe. We have seen the unsatisfactory results of compulsory service and we have seen that a better plan is advocated by military authorities. So we believe that there is no good reason to adopt any system of compulsory military service.

In the last analysis we do not believe that the United States needs to become the great military power of the world. Our natural position plus a strong navy and the modest army we have suggested will be enough to insure our national existence. If America has no higher aim than mere military power, it has failed in its world mission. We may make our army more efficient, but it must never become menacing, for we are the leading exponent of world peace. For that reason we cannot turn our nation into an armed camp, each home into a garrison, and each man into a soldier. In the present war we know what efforts each side has made to secure American sympathy — far greater efforts than have been made with any other neutral. Why was this? Certainly not because of our military power. Rather, it is because American opinion will be the judgment of history. It is because we have not taken advantage of other nations; because we freed Cuba, refused to de-

spoil China, are preparing to liberate the Philippines; because the true spirit of America is for a square deal. We believe that the true patriot is a patriot of peace and that he will oppose any attempt to enslave America or Americans by any system of compulsory military service.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, RAYMOND MILLER,
COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: The arguments are before you. I wish first to call attention to and contrast the contentions of each side. The affirmative have maintained that we are menaced by the dangers of war, that our present military forces are not sufficient to protect the nation adequately. To remedy this condition they have proposed a system of compulsory military service which they maintain affords the best military protection possible, and by combining a system of industrial education with it, they hope to justify the enormous expense their system would occasion. On the other hand we admit their first two contentions, that there is danger of war and that we must strengthen our military forces. We object to their plan, however, on the ground that it is un-American in principle, prohibitive in cost, inefficient in operation, and because there is a better and less expensive plan set forth by our own war department.

As the debate stands now, they must prove their plan of compulsory military service is superior to the plan advocated and set forth by the war department. If

they fail in this, they have failed to maintain their case, for certainly, if we can present a better plan to meet the needs of our country, we have presented the biggest argument there can be against the system they advocate.

Furthermore, we wish to show that they stand condemned in the testimony of their own authorities. They have cited Germany in support of their system, and yet they are not advocating the German system, for that requires two years' training for the infantry and three years for the cavalry. It is just this that we object to in their system. They have, in the most approved manner of the alarmist, set before us the awful dangers of war and the need for trained men. But they have not provided for the adequate training of soldiers. Certainly if Germany cannot make a soldier out of her citizens in one year of intensive training, and the hours of the conscript in Germany are long ones, we of the United States have no warrant for believing that we can train up an army to meet these seasoned veterans that menace us by only requiring three hours per day for nine months and three months' full time from our men. If Germany is an argument in favor of their system, they must advocate the German system.

Again, they say they have gone to the highest military authorities in the country for their figures, namely to Generals Wood and Wotherspoon. We are glad to hear them admit the importance of these men as military authorities, for it is their system that we are advocating. Certainly, if they admit that Generals Wood and Wotherspoon are the highest military authorities of the

nation, they have admitted the validity of our argument that the plan we are advocating is superior to the plan they have proposed. Certainly the best military authorities of the nation would be supposed to devise the best plan for national defense.

We are glad to admit the value of the industrial education they suggest, but that is beside the question. The question provides for military service, not industrial education. They have attached a good rider to a poor bill. If they had thought that their system of military service was enough to justify itself, they would not have been forced to attach an educational system to it. It is a confession of weakness on their part. Other nations find that it requires at least two years to train a soldier. In the rash enthusiasm of youth, the gentlemen of the affirmative would have us believe that we can educate a man and make a soldier out of him in a year. We would like to ask the gentlemen if this is not an idea they have evolved themselves. Surely they cannot cite a single military authority who is willing to maintain that the military training alone can be imparted in a year, let alone the industrial education.

And again as to need and cost. These same military authorities they have so highly praised have said that a standing army of 200,000 men and a reserve of 300,000 would be sufficient for our needs as a nation. Then how can they be justified in having us maintain 800,000 each year? As to cost, there is no comparison. The cheapest way to maintain soldiers is as reserves. The cost of a reserve would not be over \$100 per year.

Our reserves would cost us about \$300,000 per year. We would only have to maintain 200,000 men at full cost as compared with the 800,000 half trained, nondescript army they would have us taxed for each year. They must justify such enormous cost, and to do it they will have to retract their former statement as to the worth of Generals Wood and Wotherspoon as military authorities, for these gentlemen have put themselves on record as believing a standing army of 200,000 men with 300,000 reserves are sufficient for our national defences.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, RALPH C. SMITH,
COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: We have listened to the attack upon the system of national defences we have proposed and the attempt to show it impracticable. We know that it is possible to go through the report of the war department and by selecting isolated statements here and there to present quite a plausible case against the system. But this fact remains, and this fact they cannot deny. This is the plan proposed by Generals Wood and Wotherspoon, and Generals Wood and Wotherspoon have both held the highest military office in this country, both been at the head of our army. If it would be impossible to enlist 70,000 men each year, surely they would know it, if any one did. They would not point out the need of increasing our military defences and then suggest a plan that past army records show could not work. Surely from our nation of 100,000,000 we can find 70,000 able-bodied men each

year who would be willing to enlist in the service of their country. The gentlemen of the affirmative have not denied our statement that the plan of the war department is a better means of defence than compulsory military service and cheaper. They have only tried to show it impracticable.

The first speaker of the affirmative, in showing how we might become involved in war, mentioned four sources of danger, Hawaii, Japan, the Panama Canal, and in enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in South America. Granted that these are the four gravest dangers of war, we would like to have them explain to us how compulsory military service would be of any value to us should war arise. Take them up in order. Suppose Japan did try to take Hawaii away from us, what we would need would be a navy, not an army. Germany has long had her army in sight of England, but England is to-day free from the invader because of her naval power. Our position would be like that of Germany. If we had a strong army and Japan could control the Pacific, she could wrest the Hawaiian Islands from us despite our best efforts. In case of war with Japan, that nation would not strike at the homeland first. She would capture Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines, and again what we would need is a navy, not an army. If the Panama Canal was attacked, we would again be helpless unless we had a strong navy, because Mexico lies between us and Panama, and unless we treated her like Germany has treated Belgium, we could not get our soldiers there to defend it. The same holds true of enforcing the

Monroe Doctrine in South America. If these are the sources of the dangers that threaten us, gentlemen of the affirmative, then you have failed to provide a means for protection from them. Your plan makes no provision for a navy.

If you had a question of law to decide, would you consult the Pullman porter or the best lawyer you could find? If your eyes gave you trouble, to whom would you go, the village blacksmith or an expert oculist? Now in this question of military preparedness, in this matter that may affect the very existence of our nation, to whom should we turn for advice? The fanatics who are crying intervention in Mexico, war with Japan, war with Germany, and jingoism in general, or to the military authorities of our nation? Generals Wood and Wotherspoon have spent their lives in the military service of their nation and in studying its needs for defence. They have each successively held the highest military position in our nation. Gentlemen of the affirmative, don't you think they know better than we our present weaknesses? Don't you think they know better than any one else what steps are necessary to perfect our national defences? In case of actual war, to whom would we trust the leadership of our armies? To the fanatics, or to these men? Don't you think they have heard of compulsory military service, when, as you have told us, it is so widely practiced in Europe? If it presents the best system of national protection, don't you suppose our own military authorities would be advocating it, instead of another? Gentlemen, they know

that such a system is un-American, that its cost is prohibitive, and that it does not give us real protection. For this reason they are advocating a system which is not un-American, the cost of which would be but a fraction of that of compulsory military service, and one that does insure our national protection. This, gentlemen, is the system which, to the best of our ability, we have presented to you to-night. These, then, are our reasons for believing that we should not adopt a system of compulsory military service.

COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Belloc, Hillaire. *The Demand for Universal Service*. *Fortnightly Review*. Dec., 1913. Vol. 94:1047-1056.

Brooks, Sidney. *The Army of the United States*. *Nineteenth Century*. June, 1914. Vol. 75:1194-1206.

Calkins, C. G. *Compulsory Military Service*. (In *Cyclopedia of American Government*.) N. Y. 1914, pp. 438-439. Vol. 2.

Calkins, C. G. *Militia*. (In *Cyclopedia of American Government*.) Vol. 2, N. Y., 1914, pp. 349-441.

Calkins, C. G. *Compulsory Military Service*, legislation of 1792, modified in 1903, p. 439.

Caldwell, Charles E. *Official Case Against Compulsory Military Service*. Blackwood. Jan., 1911. Vol. 189, p. 104.

Campbell, A. J. *Young Liberal Pamphlet*. *Nineteenth Century*. Feb., 1914. Vol. 75:446-458.

Carter, W. H. *Military Preparedness*. *North American Review*. May, 1910. Vol. 191:636-643. See especially p. 641.

Changes of Current in Political Thought. *Edinburgh Review*. Jan., 1912. Vol. 215, pp. 112-122.

Compulsory Service. Lord Roberts versus Lord Haldane. *Quarterly Review*. Apr., 1911. Vol. 214:555-575.

Cox, H. *The Demand for Compulsion*. *Edinburgh Review*. Apr., 1913. Vol. 217.

Erroll, C. G. H. *Haldane's Dream of a National Army. Nineteenth Century.* Apr., 1908. Vol. 61:542-547.

The House of Lords and Universal Service. Nineteenth Century. Aug. Vol. 66:293-298.

Fallacies of the Doctrine of Compulsory Service. Contemporary. Sept., 1909. Vol. 96:295-303.

Gillet, Ransom. *Speech on the Resolutions of the Legislature of New York Relating to the Militia.* March 14, 1836. Washington, Blair & Rives, 1836. 8 p. Discusses *Compulsory Military Service.*

Goltz, Colmar, freiherr von der. *The Conduct of the War;* a brief study of its most important principles and forms. Tr. from the German by J. T. Dickman. Kansas City, Mo. The Hudson Kimberly Co. 1896. 217 p. *Compulsory Service,* pp. 16-17.

The Nation in Arms. Tr. from the German by Philip A. Ashworth. London. W. H. Allen & Co., 1887. 391 p. *Compulsory Service,* pp. 4 and 17.

Haldane and the Army. Quarterly Review. Apr., 1907. Vol. 206:457-480.

Hale, L. *Compulsory Service. Nineteenth Century.* Feb., 1911. Vol. 69:225-235.

Hamilton, Sir Ian S. M. *Compulsory Service.* A study in the light of experience. 2d Ed. London. Murray, 1911. 212 p.

Hammond, J. L. *The Future of Volunteers. Contemporary Review.* March, 1907. Vol. 91:379-387.

Hurd, A. *Compulsory Service. The War Office Vote. Nineteenth Century.* Jan., 1911. Vol. 69:133-149.

Interstate National Guard Association. The "Dick" bill and comments. H. R. 11,654 "A bill to promote the efficiency of the militia and for other purposes," to supersede the archaic militia laws enacted in 1792. Brooklyn, *Interstate National Guard Association.* 1902. 30 p. *Report of the Executive Committee.* July, 1902. Brooklyn, *Interstate National Guard Association.* 1902. 39 p. Discusses *Compulsory Military Service.*

Jeffreys, Henry B. *The Working Classes and the National Army. Nineteenth Century.* Jan., 1912, Vol. 71:86-97.

Lea, Homer. *The Valor of Ignorance.* N. Y. & London.

Harper, 1909, 343 p. Contents: 1, the decline of militancy and the control of the Western Hemisphere. 2. The decline of militancy and the control of the Pacific.

Maude, Frederic N. *On Tactics and Organization; or English Military Institutions and the continental systems.* London, W. Thacker & Co., 1888, 587 p; *Compulsory Service*, p. 14, 24.

Maude, Frederic N. *Volunteer Service Versus Compulsory Service.* *Contemporary Review*, July, 1911, Vol. 100:31-43.

Miller, Joseph D. *Militarism and Manhood.* *Arena*, Oct., 1900, Vol. 24:379-392.

Monkswell, R. C. *Haldane's Scheme of Army Organization.* *Fortnightly*, Sept., 1909, Vol. 92:510-518.

Must We All Bear Arms? *Nation*, Sept., 25, 1913, Vol. 97:278-279.

Nation (Editorial). *General Wood's Plan for A Short Term Enlistment in the Army.* *Nation*, June 22, 1911, Vol. 92:616.

Roberts, Frederick S. R., 1st earl. *Fallacies and Facts; An Answer to Compulsory Service.* London, Murray, 1911, p. 247.

A Nation in Arms; Speeches on the Requirements of the British Army. N. Y. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1907, 222 p.

Sharpe, Alfred C. *The Present Military Educational System of the U.S. Opportunities and Obligations of National Guard Officers Under Dick Militia Law.* Denver, Colorado Commandery, M. C. L. L. U. S., 1905, 36 p.

Stimson, Henry L. *What is the Matter With Our Army?* Washington (Government Printing Office), 1912, 43 p, 62d Cong., 2d Sess. *Senate Document*, 621.

Vincent, Sir Charles E. H. *The U. S. Army.* London. J. J. Kelliher & Co., 1905, 26 p; *Compulsory Military Service*, p. 1-2.

War Department. *Plan of the Standing Army of 200,000 Men.* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1840, 16 p; *Compulsory Military Service*, p. 6-13.

Wotherspoon, William W. *The Training of the Efficient Soldier.* *American Academy of Political Science. Annals*, July, 1905, Vol. 26, p. 149-160.

Wood, Leonard. *Why We Have An Army.* *McClure's*, April, 1912, Vol. 38 677-688.

World's Work. Regular and special numbers. *Dealing With War and U. S. Preparedness and Military System*, Sept., 1914, April, 1915.

Yeaman, G. H. *Allegiance and Citizenship. An inquiry into the Claim of European Governments to Exact Military Service of Naturalized Citizens of the U. S.* Copenhagen, printed by F. Meller, 1867, 50 p.

**GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF
INTERSTATE RAILROADS**

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

In 1915 the colleges of Minnesota arranged a pentangular debate on the "government ownership of interstate railroads" question. This was the first and only year of the pentangular league. The debates were held on the evening of April 16, 1915.

The speeches given here are those of the Carleton College debaters who met the Hamline College Affirmative and the Gustavus Adolphus College Negative teams gaining a unanimous decision in each debate. For a number of years the Carleton teams have maintained an unbroken record of victories in debate, debating each year on each side of the proposition in a triangular or pentangular arrangement.

The question was stated as follows: Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railways.

The Carleton speeches were contributed in behalf of the debaters by Mr. I. M. Cochran of the Department of Public Speaking of Carleton College. Mr. Cochran has had charge of the debating at Carleton during the rather long period of Carleton's annual victories.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

*CARLETON COLLEGE vs. GUSTAVUS
ADOLPHUS COLLEGE*

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE, R. H. KITTS, CARLETON
COLLEGE, '17

Ladies and Gentlemen: The question of the control of the railroads has become a serious and important issue. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, once said that whoever owns the railroads of a country, determines very largely the future of that country, and nowhere is the truth of this statement better exemplified than it is in the United States. Our railroads control over one-third of the mileage of the world, their employees number one out of twelve of our adult male population, the capital invested in them is estimated to represent one-eighth of the wealth of the country, and their annual revenues are three times as great as those of the federal government. A system of such magnitude is capable of wielding a powerful influence, and may dangerously affect the business life of a country unless properly managed. Recognizing the close relation between the transportation lines and the whole economic life of the people, the government of every civilized nation has

found it necessary to interfere with the management of its railroads. In some countries, notably the United States, this has taken the form of regulation; in the majority of others, public regulation has been superseded by public ownership. To-day, seventy per cent. of the mileage of the world, exclusive of the United States, is government owned and operated, and in our own country the trend toward government ownership is going steadily forward. Beginning with a mild form of regulation in 1887, we have found it necessary gradually to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, until now, President Ripley of the Santa Fé Railroad actually suggests that the government regulate more stringently and guarantee to the railroads net earnings of six per cent. Obviously such a step is little short of government ownership. We believe that nothing but government ownership can prove a satisfactory solution of the railroad problem. In advocating its adoption to-night, we shall not attempt to prove that the present system is utterly bad or that government ownership would be faultless. We shall simply attempt to prove that government ownership will be better than private ownership. We shall show that there are certain inherent abuses in the system of private ownership which regulation cannot eradicate; that government ownership will remedy these abuses, without in turn promoting any serious evils of its own; and finally, that in certain other respects government ownership will be a desirable and expedient measure.

No one can deny that there are grave abuses existing

under our present system. The demand for further regulation is proof of this point. One of these abuses is the powerful political influence which the railroads exercise in their own interests. Ever since a policy of government regulation has been adopted, the railroads have deemed it their duty to oppose all legislation pertaining to the railroads, except such as confers upon them special advantages. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recently completed an investigation of the affairs of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad in Tennessee, which shows that during the last eight years this railroad has been conducting an elaborate political and publicity campaign, at an expenditure of millions of dollars. A similar situation existed in the State of Massachusetts during the 1913 session of the legislature, and it is a notorious fact that the railroads dominate the politics of Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, extending their influence even to the elections of Supreme Court judges. In Congress during the recent session, it was found that eight large railway systems had secretly pledged forty thousand dollars for the purpose of lobbying through a river and harbor "pork-barrel" appropriation bill. These few examples sufficiently illustrate the enormity of the evil which Professor Jenks of Cornell University, a member of the United States Industrial Commission, terms "the chief menace to the integrity of our institutions and to the welfare of our country." The cause of this political influence is easily found. We do not maintain, nor do we believe, that our state and national governments are corrupted by the railroads. What we do maintain, is that

our enormous transportation system, with its employees in every city and village in the United States, is part of the government itself. It dominates the press and controls elections, electing its own men as legislators and even as judges. Public regulation forces the railway corporation into politics whether it will or not. Legislation cannot eliminate the evil because the railroads have no respect for the laws. The Interstate Commerce Commission cannot eliminate it for the same reason. The evil is inherent in the system of private ownership, and clearly, nothing but a change in the system itself will prove adequate in removing the railroads from politics.

Another abuse is that commonly known as stock manipulation. Wall Street is rapidly assuming an important part in the railroad world. Investigations conducted during the last few years disclose the fact that large railway shareholders depend more upon the fluctuations of the market for their profits, than upon the division of the actual earnings of the business. Startling disclosures were made in this connection in the course of the recent New Haven investigation. Here the small stockholder lost practically his entire investment; he was crowded out; and his savings were concentrated in the hands of the big speculators, increasing their already enormous fortunes. It is estimated that the minority stockholders lost one hundred million dollars in this single instance. Similar manipulations are being made in the stocks of other roads, notably the Great Western and the Rock Island. Rock Island stock at the present time is actually worth

but three-fourths of a cent on the dollar, and this road which ten years ago was one of the best equipped and most prosperous in the country is now one of the poorest, as a result of the exploitation of its owners. Like conditions prevail upon the Pere Marquette, the Southern Pacific, the Frisco, and many other lines. Such is the problem which confronts us. Many of our roads are in the hands of men who are not even interested in the actual management of the roads, but who hold the property merely as a speculative enterprise. Here again, the evil is a direct outgrowth of the system of private ownership with its primary desire for gain. Legislation in the past has proved ineffectual, and we have no reason to believe that it will remedy matters in the future.

A third abuse is the excessive rates charged by the railroads to-day. The Interstate Commerce Commission fixes rates which are sufficient to pay operating expenses and to allow a fair surplus for the paying of dividends upon the capital invested. At the present time the dividends indicate that the rates are reasonable, but the fact is, the railroads are receiving exorbitant earnings and are forcing them to appear reasonable by charging to them extensive improvements which should be charged to new capital. For according to decisions of the United States Supreme Court, improvements which add to the permanent value of the property should not be paid from the current returns of the railroads, but rather should be charged to new capital. But this is not all. After charging these improvements to the earnings, the railroads then

proceed to capitalize them, thereby obtaining a basis for demanding still higher rates from the Interstate Commerce Commission. To-day forty-one railroads are seeking to have rates increased, because they assert present rates do not yield them a fair profit. They attempt to justify their claim by pointing to the fact that they are paying only three and a half per cent. on their capital investment, but, although it is true that they are paying a small dividend, their net earnings, according to Chairman Thorne of the Iowa Commission, actually range from twelve to eighteen per cent. on the capital stock. The apparently reasonable dividend is made possible by the fact that they have spent annually over one hundred and fifty million dollars in additions and betterments and have charged these to the earnings. Furthermore, they have capitalized these improvements and are now demanding rates sufficiently high to pay dividends upon this increased capitalization. Thus, as Senator La Follette has said, the process operates as a "vicious circle," for by making their earnings appear reasonable, the railroads exact excessive rates from the public, and then by capitalizing the improvements which have been wrongly charged to earnings, they are able to press their claims for still higher rates, thereby assessing the public for the money which the public itself has already put into the business. According to Chairman Thorne, the very railroads which are now applying for an increase in rates, receive annually four hundred million dollars more than a fair profit. Obviously, this evil, a result of the ever present desire for gain, is an enormous drain on the public,— a drain which

will exist as long as private ownership exists,— a drain which can be eliminated only by a change in the system itself.

Thus far, then, Ladies and Gentlemen, the affirmative has proved that some change is necessary in our present system of railway transportation: first, because the railroads possess a powerful political influence which they exercise in their own interests; secondly, because railway managers throughout the country are turning their attention to stock manipulation for their profits, at the expense of the small stockholders and the actual management of the business; and finally, because the railroads are charging excessive rates, which are made to appear reasonable by an unjust system of accounting. In view of the fact that these abuses are inherent in the system of private ownership, we believe that they warrant a demand for a change in the system which fosters them.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, JOHN E. MULLIGAN, CARLETON
COLLEGE, '15

Ladies and Gentlemen: In taking up the debate for the negative the speaker who just left the floor has told you that government ownership would be inexpedient in this country because our rates and services are so good under private ownership that a change to government ownership could not better them. He has told you that our rates and services are just as good under private ownership as are the rates and services of Germany under government ownership and has argued from this that government ownership could not improve conditions in

this country. Now we shall neither deny nor affirm this statement in regard to Germany for as a matter of fact it has absolutely no bearing upon the question under discussion this evening. Even if it were true that our rates and services are just exactly the same as those given in Germany it would not necessarily follow that our rates and services could not be bettered under government ownership for as the gentleman of the negative has himself asserted conditions in Germany are vastly different from conditions in the United States. The mere fact that conditions upon our railroads are good in some respects cannot be accepted as conclusive evidence that they could not be improved. It may be that the rates and services given in Germany are just as good as could possibly be secured in that country. But it does not necessarily follow that the same rates and services are as good as could be secured in the United States. Indeed, as my colleague has already pointed out, excessive rates are a serious evil upon our privately owned railroad system.

In introducing the case for government ownership of the railroads, my colleague, after showing that there is at present a strongly marked and ever increasing tendency toward government ownership in this country, has pointed out three very serious evils which exist to-day upon our privately owned railroads; the evils of political influence, of unjust stock manipulation and of excessive rates. We have shown that each of these evils is directly resultant from the fact that the ownership of our railroads is in private hands; that they are inherent in the system of private ownership and must exist as long as this form of

ownership and control exist. Now these evils are certainly serious enough to demand a change and government ownership is the only change which can eradicate these evils.

Government ownership will eliminate these great evils of private ownership and will provide a practicable and efficient means of managing our railroads. Moreover, there will be no great difficulty involved in the adoption of government ownership. As to the purchase of the roads it is not necessary that they should all be taken over at once. They were not so acquired in Germany, in Belgium, or in any other country in which government ownership has been adopted. The method which we shall favor this evening is one of gradual assumption. Our proposition is this. That the government shall issue bonds bearing from three to four per cent. interest to the amount of three or four billion dollars and that the money thus secured shall be used in purchasing several of our larger railroad lines. To begin with we might take over the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Burlington, the Rock Island, and the Chicago and Alton. We merely cite these as lines which might well be taken over in the beginning. Then after this purchase the government could from time to time make additional bond issues and take over new lines of road until eventually the entire inter-state railroad system was in the hands of the federal government.

Now, as to the operation of these roads after they have been taken over by the government, our proposition is this. That the country shall be divided up into districts

similar to the districts now used by the Interstate Commerce Commission and that the roads in each of these districts shall be under the supervision of a district traffic chief and a board of three directors. Then that the roads of the entire country shall be under the direction of a national secretary of transportation and a board of from five to seven commissioners. We propose that all of these higher railroad officials shall be appointed by the president as are the members of the Federal Reserve Board, and furthermore, that they shall hold office during good behavior. The lesser officials and employees upon the railroads we would have subjected to rigid civil service requirements. We would also have it provided that in case it were ever necessary or desirable that Congress should make appropriations for the railroads that such appropriations must be suggested to Congress by the railroad department.

This, then, is the method by which we are proposing that our federal government shall take over and operate our inter-state railroads. This is the plan recently outlined by Mr. Martin A. Knapp, former chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the best means by which our government could possibly take over and operate our interstate railroads. Certainly there is nothing very complex or difficult of execution about such a plan. Indeed such a plan offers many distinct advantages. In the first place it would not be necessary to raise a single cent of the purchase money by taxation. The process would involve a mere substitution of government bonds for railroad securities. Furthermore, there would be no

actual increase to the national debt for the railroads are valuable, revenue producing property capable of providing for the payment of interest and the extinction of the debt. Again, since none of the railroad officials or employees would owe their positions to politics in any way, there would be no danger that politics would play an important part in the administration of the railroads. The higher railroad officials would hold office during good behavior, the lesser employees would be under the civil service; they would be entirely free, then, from danger of removal through a change in the administration of the government. Moreover, since it would be necessary that all suggestions of appropriations for the railroads must be made to Congress by the railroad department there would be no opportunity for political logrolling in the determination of extensions or improvements.

But aside from all this, in spite of the fact that our government is as our opponents have asserted, a democracy, our federal government has shown itself admirably fitted to take over such an undertaking. In the past our government has shown itself more capable of carrying on such a project than either a private corporation or the governments of foreign countries. Our national government has just completed the building of the Panama Canal, the greatest enterprise of the century, after private corporations and foreign governments had made a most miserable failure of it.

Another familiar example of the efficiency of our government is the postal department. Here the government has shown remarkable enterprise for within the last

few years it has established a rural free delivery, a postal savings department, and a parcel post. Now in establishing this rural free delivery the system was not adopted over the entire country at once but in different districts from time to time, yet political logrolling never played a part in determining which district should be given preference. The most recent undertaking of the government was the adoption of the parcel post, and here is afforded an excellent opportunity for a direct comparison between government and private enterprise. We had our express companies under the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and in general we were satisfied with the rates and services which were being given. Yet our federal government has taken over a portion of this work, is gradually assuming a larger and larger share of it, and has not only affected an enormous reduction in rates but also a great improvement in the service.

These are two excellent examples of government efficiency and enterprise. We realize that these examples are not identical with government ownership of the railroads. Certain it is that if our government takes over the ownership of our interstate railroads new problems will arise. But the establishment of the rural free delivery involved new problems, as did also the postal savings department and the parcel post. And the building of the Panama Canal was entirely unlike anything which our government had before attempted. Yet our government has met and solved successfully all of these problems and we have every reason to believe that by gradually taking over our railroads our government will

meet and solve successfully any problems which may arise.

We see, then, that government ownership will provide a practicable and efficient means of managing our inter-state railroads. We believe government ownership should be adopted because it will eliminate the evils which must always exist under private ownership.

In the first place by putting the ownership and operation of the railroads in the hands of the government the great political influence which is to-day exercised by the private owned roads will be abolished. As has been pointed out, our railroads are forced into politics by the very nature of their business. They are quasi-public agents and enjoy a portion of the sovereignty of the state. They enter the political field to protect their privileges. Regulation can only enhance this political influence. Obviously this influence is exerted because the government is attempting to determine how this private enterprise shall be managed, but government interference has been found necessary in railroad management. Consequently, this political influence can be eliminated, and can only be eliminated, by placing both the ownership and control of the railroads in the hands of the government.

As to stock gambling—it is hardly necessary to say that this evil will be eliminated by government ownership. The government will be the sole holder of securities and will have no object in speculating. Indeed, all government enterprises are absolutely free from the speculative element. This is an evil which is confined entirely to the realm of private business.

In the third place, government ownership will eliminate the evil of excessive rates. Under public ownership the railroads will no longer pay for improvements with earnings and then capitalize the results. As has been pointed out the privately owned roads do this in order to conceal from the government the true amount of their earnings. Now under government ownership there will be no object in such procedure for the government will both own and operate the roads and since the primal motive of management will no longer be profit excessive ratemaking will cease to exist.

Because government ownership can be adopted with very little difficulty then, because it will provide a practicable and efficient means of managing the railroads, and because it will eliminate the serious evils which must always exist under private ownership, we believe that our government should take over the ownership and operation of our inter-state railroads.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE, RAY J. QUINLIVAN, CARLETON
COLLEGE, '16

Ladies and Gentlemen: The speaker who just left the floor told you that government ownership would be economically undesirable because it would be necessary to pay higher wages and to permit a shorter working day. As the gentleman has already admitted, these features are not objectionable in themselves. But he asserts that the paying of higher wages and the shortening of the day would necessitate an advance in rates and that a great burden would thus be placed upon the public. If it were

true that such an increase in charges would follow, the gentleman's objection might be a valid one. But permit me to call your attention to the evidence given by my colleague showing that forty-one western railroads are making annual profits of four hundred million dollars above a fair return upon the money invested. Furthermore, as Senator La Follette has pointed out, the eastern roads are making excessive annual profits of three hundred and fifty million dollars. Now, ladies and gentlemen, under public ownership these large profits would be eliminated and, consequently, the government could not only better working conditions, but it could effect great reductions in rates.

In the course of our argument we have pointed out three serious evils which exist in our railway system to-day. In the first place we showed that the private railways possess a powerful political influence which they exercise in their own interests and contrary to the interests of the public. Secondly, we pointed out that many of our railroads are in an unsound financial condition because of the speculation of their owners. Thirdly, we pointed out that the railroads are indulging in unfair practices which result in the charging of excessive rates. We showed that government ownership, by striking at the root of the evil, will remove these abuses. Furthermore, we have shown that the purchase and operation of the roads by the government involve no serious difficulties.

The elimination of these evils we believe to be sufficient justification for a change to government ownership. But we shall go further. We shall show you that for reasons

other than the abolishing of these specific abuses, government ownership is an expedient measure. We maintain that our whole commercial and industrial life is too dependent upon the railroads to permit that they be left in private hands. Transportation is essentially a public service. It is more than a business in itself; it is a means for doing every other kind of business. The farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, the shipper, and the consumer, are all vitally affected by our transportation system. Obviously, a system which is so bound up with the public welfare, and which is capable of such great power in retarding or advancing industry should be operated primarily in the interest of the public. The private roads are not operated with this end in view; the fundamental aim of the management is profit. This results in a conflict of interest between the railroads and the public—the one demanding adequate service at a low rate, and the other seeking primarily for profit. Now, of course, the private roads are not altogether antagonistic toward the public for it is not to their advantage to be so. They serve the public to some extent, but, in reality, such service is only incidental and is not the primary motive. With the private railroads, service is only a means to an end and that end is profit. Perhaps no one could have made the situation clearer than did former President Styckney of the Great Western. When asked by an investigating committee what the aim of the railways was, he replied, "To tell the truth, gentlemen, we make as much money as we can." That a conflict of interests exists between the railroads and the public cannot be denied, for if the

aim of the managers were to serve the public, and if the making of profits were only a secondary consideration, government regulation would be unnecessary. The Interstate Commerce Commission was established in 1887 to secure the operation of the system in the interest of the public. But regulation has failed and is failing to accomplish its work in a satisfactory manner, and the prospect of satisfactory regulation in the future is even less encouraging.

Regulation has failed in two particulars. It is unsatisfactory, in the first place, because of the powerful resistance offered by the railroads. The first negative speaker would have you believe that regulation is a success because it has improved conditions. Now, we do not deny that regulation has bettered the situation, but when we consider the enormous effort and the great length of time which has been necessary because of the railroad's opposition, the results are almost insignificant. Our railways, from the very first, have fought steadily and bitterly every attempt at further regulation. The result of this opposition is a constant conflict between the railroads and the government, and a consequent delay in action. A familiar example of this difficulty of regulation is afforded right here in Minnesota. Consider for a moment the tireless efforts made by the roads in this state to secure an increase in passenger fares. Several years ago, the Commission, after careful deliberation, reduced the fare from three cents to two cents per mile. Did the railroads let the matter rest here? On the contrary they carried the case from one court to another until, finally, the

United States Supreme Court declared that the two cent fare should hold. But even this did not settle the matter. To-day the railroads in Minnesota are fighting for a two and one-half cent fare, and there is every reason to believe that if this is secured they will press their claim for a return to the original three cent fare. Thus the railroads and the Commission have been battling away for eight years without agreeing upon a satisfactory passenger fare. Now, it may be that the Commission is at fault, and it may be that the railroads are justified in their claim, but certainly a system which results in such endless litigation is not a proper solution of the problem.

Regulation has failed in the second place because it is insufficient. The most the Commission can do, and the most it can ever do as long as the ownership of the property is in private hands, is to fix rate limits and to check such acts as are unlawful. It cannot adopt a positive constructive policy; it cannot take the railroads in hand and operate them in the interest of the country. This positive power is essential to adequate regulation. The lack of this power nullifies to a great extent even the restrictive powers of the Commission. For example: Several years ago the Interstate Commerce Commission lowered freight rates throughout the country. The railroads, unable to secure an increase by means of litigation, retaliated by lowering the efficiency of their service. The Commission, lacking the power to remedy this, was helpless. Finally, the situation became so serious that shippers in all parts of the country requested that a higher rate be granted so that they might secure adequate serv-

ice. The result was that last December the Commission granted a five per cent. increase because it understood that if a higher rate were not allowed, industry would suffer as a result. This example illustrates two points. First, the Commission lacks positive power. Secondly, lack of this power renders the restrictive powers of comparatively little value. What do we gain by forcing a reduction in rates when, as a result, we get a proportionate decrease in the efficiency of the service? If the government is to regulate the railways in the interest of the country, it must have constructive power. But the government cannot be given this power without also being given the ownership of the property for, in the final analysis, the power to determine when and where extensions and additions shall be made must rest with those who are responsible for the road's finances, i.e., the owners. Therefore, if the government is to secure this power, and it must secure it in order to afford adequate regulation, it must first acquire the ownership of the property.

Thus regulation is failing in two particulars. It is failing in the first place, because of the resistance of the private roads which results in endless litigation and a consequent delay in action. It is failing in the second place, because the Commission has not positive constructive power, power which it must have and yet power which it cannot be given without also being given the ownership of the property.

But, however much regulation may have failed in the past, and however unsatisfactory it may be at present, the failure in the future will be even more marked. In

the past the railroads have been operating under a competitive system. They have been forced to give increased accommodations to the public or see a large share of their traffic drift to some competing line. In the past the Commission has found no great difficulty in securing good service; competition has assured success along that line. But to-day competition is failing; it is rapidly becoming inoperative as a regulative agency. Competition is failing because it results in great economic waste, due to the paralleling of lines, unnecessary duplication of equipment, circuitous hauling, and similar practices. The result of this failure of competition is the combination and consolidation of competing lines. Within three years, the control of one hundred twelve thousand miles of line, or three-fifths of our entire interstate mileage, has been concentrated in the hands of five capitalists. Seventy-five per cent. of the mileage of the country is controlled by a group of eight financiers, and there is no reason to believe that the process of consolidation will stop even here. For as Prof. R. T. Ely of the University of Wisconsin has pointed out, "The process of consolidation is going rapidly forward and the ultimate unification of the entire system is inevitable." Anti-trust legislation may check this movement, but it cannot stop it. In spite of legal restrictions the process of consolidation will still go forward and in the end we must face a private railway monopoly.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we are not opposed to this process of consolidation, for we believe that it is absolutely necessary that the control be centralized and that

the enormous waste of competition be eliminated. But we do not believe that the power of controlling twenty billion dollars of wealth and two hundred and fifty thousand miles of line should be centralized in the hands of a few wealth-seeking financiers. We believe that when the railroad monopoly is complete, when competition will no longer force the railroads to give good service, when poor service will give a larger net return than good service, then we maintain that no government interference short of ownership can secure the operation of the roads in the interest of the public.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, because there are serious evils in the present system which regulation cannot eradicate, because government ownership, by striking at the root of the evil, will remove these abuses, because the purchase and operation of the roads involve no serious difficulties, and because regulation has failed in the past and must fail to an even greater extent in the future on account of the absence of competition, we maintain that the only permanent and proper solution of the problem is government ownership and operation of our interstate railway system.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, R. H. KITTS, CARLETON
COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: Our opponents have spent a great deal of time in an attempt to prove that government ownership has been a failure in foreign countries. Now we do not believe this to be the case, in fact, it is worthy of note, that no country having once adopted public own-

ership has returned permanently to private ownership. However, no fair comparison can be drawn between these countries and the United States because conditions are essentially different. For instance: foreign governments passed directly to public ownership from private ownership without the intermediate stage of regulation. Thus they took up railroad operation knowing nothing of railroad management, while on the other hand, the United States government has the benefit of twenty-seven years' experience in railroad management through regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Obviously, no analogy can be drawn between these countries and the United States.

In the course of our argument this evening, we of the affirmative have shown that there are certain inherent abuses in the present system of railroad operation which regulation cannot eradicate, namely, political influence, stock manipulation, and excessive rates. My colleague has shown that government ownership will remedy these abuses without promoting any serious evils of its own. However, our opponents have advanced a plan which includes federal incorporation of railroad charters, and by the adoption of this plan, they assert that the abuses which we have pointed out will be remedied without resorting to government ownership. Now the gentlemen have not shown when or where such a plan has worked out successfully. They failed to tell you that the strongest advocates of federal incorporation, or in other words federal regulation of stock and bond issues, are the railroads themselves. They failed to tell you that the Railroad

Securities Commission, a commission appointed for the express purpose of investigating the advisability of the regulation of securities, has strongly warned Congress against the adoption of such a plan. The negative simply asserts that the adoption of this plan would remedy all the abuses which we have shown are inherent in the present system.

However, their plan as advanced will not even attempt to eradicate the political corruption existing at the present time. They next assert that federal incorporation would eliminate stock manipulation by regulating all new issues of stocks and bonds. But stock manipulation does not necessarily entail an issue of new securities,—in fact, a large share of it consists in manipulation of securities already existing. Now in just what way is the plan of the negative going to eliminate this form of manipulation? But the gentlemen further assert that federal incorporation of railroad charters would prevent capitalization of improvements which have already been charged to earnings. However, the State of Massachusetts has regulated all issues of securities for twenty years, yet to-day public service corporations in that state are employing these same unjust practices of accounting and are thereby charging excessive rates. But, even if regulation of securities would prevent this unjust capitalization — which is doubtful — how is it going to prevent the equally unjust practice of charging improvements to earnings?

Thus at the best, the plan advanced by the negative is only a halfway measure and for this reason we believe we are justified in maintaining that the abuses which we

have pointed out are inherent in the system of private ownership, and that no form of regulation can eradicate them.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, JOHN E. MULLIGAN,
CARLETON COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: The speaker who just left the floor has questioned the authority which we have given in support of our plan for government ownership. He asks us just where such a plan has ever been tried out. Now, as we have already pointed out this plan has been approved by Mr. Martin A. Knapp, former chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. But the gentlemen tell us that Mr. Knapp does not really favor government ownership and does not even believe that this plan will eliminate the opportunity for political influence as we have claimed that it would do. Here the gentlemen are clearly in error for Mr. Knapp says in speaking of this very plan, "The stringent civil service rule and the popular sentiment would so effectively condemn any attempt to use the railway employees for political purposes that any danger in this direction would soon disappear." A system very similar to this has been adopted in Switzerland where government ownership is in practice, and it has worked out very successfully in that country. Dr. Frank Parsons, former lecturer at Harvard University, says in commenting on the results in Switzerland: "The system has worked excellently. The administration is absolutely free from the taint of party politics and the roads are operated on sound busi-

ness principles in the interest of the whole country."

The speaker went on to assert that government ownership would not provide an efficient means of managing the railroads. Upon this point, too, we must take issue with the gentlemen. There are just three things which are essential to efficient management of the railroads by any government. In the first place, the system by which the roads are administrated must provide for capable and efficient men; in the second place, the administration of the roads must be entirely removed from politics; and in the third place, the government must know how to manage the roads. All of these requirements will be secured under the system of railway management which we are advocating this evening. Capable men will be provided to do the work upon our railroads under government ownership because they will be the same men who are doing the work to-day under private ownership. The men who are employed by the railroads to-day will continue in the employ of the railroads after they have been taken over by the government. Efficient men will be provided under government ownership because they will be men who are already trained to do the work. But the gentlemen of the negative ask us just what there is about our plan which will prevent the employees from making high and exorbitant demands of the government. Now, we admit that there is nothing about this plan which will prevent the employees from making such demands. But on the other hand, there is to-day nothing to prevent such demands being made of the private owned roads. We have no reason to believe

that the railroad employees will make any higher or more exorbitant demands of the government than they now make of the privately owned roads. The employees will undoubtedly receive higher wages and shorter hours if the roads remain in private hands. To say that these will also come under government ownership, then, cannot be considered a valid objection to the adoption of that system. The gentlemen ask us what there is about our plan which will prevent the employees from exercising a strong political influence. The fact that the railroad officials and employees are all either to hold office during good behavior or to be under civil service requirements will remove any danger from this source. It has long been recognized as a truth in our American system of government that to allow a man to hold office during good behavior effectually removes his office from politics. The same thing may be said of the civil service. With our railway employees under such rules none of them would owe their position to politics in any way. Political influences could neither grant a position nor take it away. There would be no cause then which would make it necessary for the railroad officials or employees to be influenced by politics in any way. We have no more reason to believe, therefore, that our railroad officials would be subject to political influence than we have to believe that any other class of our citizens would be subject to such influence. Again we have been asked what there is about the system of railroad management which we are advocating which will prevent the use of political logroll-

ing in the making of appropriations. Now as we have already pointed out politics cannot enter into the making of appropriations for the railroads because it is to be made obligatory that all suggestions for such appropriations must be made to Congress by the Railway Department. If politics has entered into the making of such appropriations for the postal department it has only been because they are suggested to Congress in nearly every case by members of that body itself. This would not be possible under the advocated plan of government ownership.

Finally, government ownership will be efficient because our government knows how to manage the railroads. For twenty-seven years the government has been attempting to regulate the roads by a commission. Regulation has failed only because it has been impossible to give the commission sufficient power under private management. Our government then has already acquired experience in railroad management. No other country in the world ever had such an opportunity to learn the details of railroad management before taking over the roads. Moreover, as we are advocating that the government shall take the roads over gradually it will be given still further opportunity to become acquainted with the details of railroad management before the entire system comes under federal control. Since government ownership will provide efficient men then, since it will remove the administration from politics, and since the government knows how to manage the roads we must conclude that it will provide an efficient means of railroad management.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, RAY J. QUINLIVAN,
CARLTON COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: In opening the argument in favor of government ownership of railways we first showed you that there are certain specific evils in the present system which regulation has failed to remove and which regulation cannot remedy because they are inherent in the system of private ownership and public regulation. Let us now review the stand which our opponents have taken with regard to these abuses. We showed in the first place that the private railways possess a powerful political influence which they exercise in their own interests and contrary to the interests of the public. The gentlemen of the negative do not deny the existence of such influence, but they say that it is being eliminated until at the present time or that it has been practically abolished. Now, as my colleague has pointed out, this evil is more serious to-day than at any previous time and political grafting is increasing as regulation increases. But our opponents tell you that greater political dangers will accompany government ownership. However, the dangers under ownership are merely incidental and can be removed by placing the administration in the hands of an independent commission, while the evil of the present is due directly to the fact that we are attempting to determine how private business shall be managed.

The second evil which we pointed out was the fact that many of our railroads are in an unsound financial condi-

tion because of the speculation of their owners. The gentlemen tell you that this can be cared for by forcing the railways to take out a federal charter. We asked them to give us specific evidence to prove that the desired result would be accomplished. They told you that the national banks must hold federal charters and that, consequently, there is no speculation. But, ladies and gentlemen, federal incorporation is not responsible for this condition. To illustrate: Our state governments have succeeded in eliminating speculation from state banks, but they have failed in preventing speculation in industrial stocks and bonds. Consequently, the absence of speculation from our national banks is due to the peculiar characteristics of the business rather than to the fact that they hold federal charters. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that such incorporation can prevent speculation in the stocks of our railroads.

A third evil is the fact that our railways are indulging in unfair practices which result in the charging of excessive rates. As my colleague has explained, the railways make their earnings appear reasonable by charging to them vast improvements, and then they proceed to capitalize these improvements, thereby securing a basis for demanding even higher rates. Our opponents attempt to remedy this evil also by applying their proposed federal incorporation. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have no assurance that they would be successful in bettering the situation for they simply told you that a federal charter would do the work and let the matter rest there. But let us assume for the moment that they would be successful

in preventing the roads from indulging in these practices. What would be the result? Simply this: The railroads would refuse to make these betterments and inefficient service would follow. The companies make these improvements now because they are permitted to charge them to earning expenses and to secure higher rates by increasing their capitalization. But if these practices are forbidden the incentive to progress will be removed, and what will remain of our adequate private transportation system? Thus, in attempting to remedy the evils which we have pointed out, our opponents have either given a solution which cannot accomplish the work they claim for it, or one which must introduce even greater evils.

But we have gone further and showed the rapid consolidation of systems which is taking place and which must result in a great private railway monopoly. We showed that such a condition would be intolerable. Our opponents admit that a monopoly is undesirable, but they say that by permitting the railways to pool their interests they will remove the incentive to consolidation. Now although pooling has been illegal in the past, the Interstate Commerce Commission has not been in sympathy with the provision and as a result pooling has gone on. But, as President Hadley of Yale has pointed out, "In spite of the fact that pooling has been permitted, the railways have continued to consolidate." In view of the fact that pooling in the past has not prevented consolidation, there is no reason for believing that it can accomplish such a result in the future. Thus, since our op-

ponents admit that a private monopoly must not be permitted, and we have shown that a monopoly of some sort is inevitable, therefore, the only remaining course is public monopoly, i.e., government ownership.

But, finally, ladies and gentlemen, the fundamental issue lies between government regulation and government ownership and operation. Our opponents take the stand that although regulation is not perfect it is better to continue the present policy than to turn to government ownership which, they say, involves even greater difficulties. Here we take issue with the gentlemen. We maintain that it is far more simple for the government to operate government enterprise than to supervise private enterprise. If the government can fix rates for the private roads, if it can supervise the accounting methods, if it can determine the quality of service, if it can tell them when and where they shall extend their lines, if it can tell them when and when not they may issue stocks, in short, if it can regulate in every detail the management of the private roads, and this is what it must do under the plan proposed by the negative, then, we maintain that the same government can operate the railroads even more successfully for it will no longer be confronted by the opposition of the private managers. Government operation involves all the advantages of government regulation, and it excludes the one great disadvantage — the opposition of the private property holders. When the government has the ownership of the property it can accomplish what it is trying to accomplish at present and what it is failing to accomplish because the ownership by private

companies places too much power in the hands of a few financiers.

Government interference is necessary. Upon this we are agreed. We also agree that further restrictive measures are necessary. The fundamental question is one of degree of interference. We of the affirmative maintain that the government will not have sufficient power until it has the ownership of the property and until it can take the railroads in hand and operate them in the interest of the country. We maintain that no power short of ownership can do away with the railroad lobby, for this is an evil which has arisen directly from our policy of regulation. We maintain that no power short of ownership can eliminate speculation and the unfair practices which result in high rates, for these evils are deeply rooted in the system of private ownership. We maintain that, when the railroad monopoly is complete, no power short of ownership can secure adequate service. We maintain that no power short of ownership will make it possible for the government to adopt a positive constructive policy and operate the roads in the interest of the country. And, finally, we maintain that no power short of actual ownership can do away with the endless litigation which accompanies all attempts at regulation, and that this power alone can secure the dominance of public interest in the management of the roads. And, ladies, and gentlemen, in view of these considerations, we maintain that the only permanent and practical solution of the problem is government ownership and operation of our interstate railway system.

HAMLINE COLLEGE vs. CARLETON COLLEGE

FIRST NEGATIVE, THOMAS O. YOUNG, CARLETON COLLEGE, '15

Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have spent considerable time in deplored the conditions on American railroads. We realize that our present system is not ideal and that there are certain defects which demand a remedy, but on the other hand, we do not believe that conditions to-day warrant any such radical change as government ownership. The affirmative have argued that government ownership is necessary because of the overcapitalization on our railroads. But the gentlemen forget that according to all recent physical valuations overcapitalization does not exist to-day. Chas. A. Prouty, formerly of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who is now at the head of the Commission which is taking a physical valuation of the railroads says that the physical value actually exceeds the capitalization.

In a like manner political corruption was a serious evil some years ago but is largely eliminated to-day. The railroads have abandoned the old political lobby and are depending upon different forms of publicity to put their case before the people and upon the fairness of the American public to give them what is justly theirs. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, though the affirmative contention might have been good argument ten years ago: to-day it is of little value.

We of the negative will show first this evening that government ownership of the railroads would be inex-

pedient. It would be inexpedient in the first place because it is not adaptable to American conditions. From the standpoint of those favoring government ownership Germany is generally considered the best example. Let us consider some of the differences existing between Germany and the United States. The foundation of German industry is built upon the paternalistic idea, looking to government interference with the minutest details of the life of the people, while all phases of business rely upon government initiative. In accordance with this Germany has a bureaucratic form of government with the most complex machinery for the handling of government enterprise in the world. In the United States conditions are entirely different. Since the beginning of our history we have resented public interference with private affairs and have relied upon individual initiative as free from government interference as possible. We have not built up a system of government calculated to take over such a big proportion of the country's industries as the transportation system. Germany has a strongly centralized, bureaucratic form of government; ours is essentially different; a two party system, practically the entire government changing with a change in party control. The German people temperamentally and by military discipline are inclined to take severe, restrictive control as a matter of course. The American people are democratic and essentially cosmopolitan in character. They have been taught the principle of "the land of the free" with as little government interference as possible. The railroads of Germany were taken over by the government

as a military precaution. They have been developed so as to be of the greatest military advantage to the country. Our railroads have been built to meet the industrial needs of the nation and developed in connection with our commercial growth, without any military considerations whatsoever. W. M. Acworth, the noted British Economist says, "that the farther a government gets from autocracy and the more it develops in the direction of democracy, the less successful it is likely to be with government ownership of the railways." As concrete evidence of this fact, countries with governments similar to ours have made hopeless failures of government ownership of the railways. The government railways of France are of a much lower standard than the privately owned lines of the same country. Service is poor, rates are not well adjusted, many evil practices exist, and they are creating an annual deficit of sixteen million dollars. Australia is generally recognized as having one of the poorest and most inefficiently managed government owned systems in the world. The people are actually forced by the government to depend upon a three gauge system for their transportation. Canada and Switzerland have also tried government ownership and the experiment has been characterized by inefficiency and corrupt practices. From this evidence we must conclude that government ownership of the railways would not be adaptable to the United States.

Government ownership of the railways would be inexpedient in the second place because it would not bring about an improvement in rates and services upon Ameri-

can railways. Rates and services in this country are more satisfactory to the American public than rates and services in foreign countries are to their patrons. The chief point to be considered in analyzing the railway system is that of its relation to the general public, and the general public is most directly affected by the adequacy of the service which the railways furnish. In this respect the American railways lead the world. American railways have succeeded in extending their facilities until they are meeting satisfactorily the transportation needs of practically the entire country. The capacity of railway trackage and equipment in proportion both to population and area is not surpassed by any other country. Speaking of our freight service, President Hadley of Yale says: "Our railroads are even better equipped than those of Europe for the economical handling of long distance freight." Prof. W. Z. Ripley, professor of economics at Harvard, says: "The American shipper has received at the hands of the railways a more adequate service than the shippers of any other country in the world."

If government ownership has demonstrated that as a railway policy it is capable of bringing about a more adequate service than private ownership, it is reasonable to suppose that it would improve our service in that respect, but if it has not accomplished this in other countries there is no logical reason to assume that it would do so in the United States. Germany is undoubtedly the best example of government ownership of the railways, yet there is much dissatisfaction with the service. Prof. Hugo R. Meyer of the University of Chicago says, "that

numerous German industries are forced to rely on cumbersome water transportation and that the government tries to encourage this form of transportation in order to escape the burden of extending railway lines." He says further that German industries have again and again demanded more railway lines but that the government steadily refuses to comply. In the United States the railways have not waited for the people to demand more lines but they have been built into entirely new territory for the purpose of developing that territory. Prof. Meyer says that German industry to-day demands cars of forty and fifty tons' capacity, yet the government will furnish nothing but cars of an average of sixteen tons' capacity. Shippers in this country long ago demanded large cars and their demands have been granted. Prof. W. Z. Ripley of Harvard says that in many districts in Germany traffic is greatly congested because of the lack of double tracks; in the United States double tracks have been laid wherever the traffic has demanded it. As a result to-day we have 26,000 miles of double track and this inconvenience is unknown. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, even in Germany, which stands out predominately among countries having government owned railways, government ownership has not succeeded in making service as adequate as it is in the United States. Why, then, should we assume that it would make our service any more adequate?

The general public is affected secondly by the rates which the railways charge for transportation. We shall make no comparison of rates in the United States and

rates in countries having government ownership although many authorities assert positively that rates are relatively lower in this country than anywhere else in the world. What we do maintain is that American railway rates regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various state regulative agencies are more satisfactory to the American people than rates on government owned roads are to their patrons. The rates in this country are generally conceded to be reasonably well adapted to the industrial and commercial needs of the nation. Nobody to-day maintains that freight rates are too high. The Interstate Commerce Commission has steadily reduced them until very recently. The railways are now earning but four and one-half per cent. upon their capital and this is generally admitted to be no more than a fair return. The government operating the same railways could not make lower rates and still make sufficient money to pay the interest on their debt.

Government ownership where it has been tried has been characterized by rigid rates. Andrew D. White former United States Ambassador to Germany says, "German freight rates are ill adapted to the industrial and commercial needs of the country." Discrimination has also existed to a great extent. Frances A. Rounce, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Railway News and Statistics says that in Australia the government grants discriminatory rates regardless of the protest from the public. Poor adjustment of rates seems to be the rule wherever government ownership is in effect. The rates in this country on the contrary have been flexible and adapt-

able to the varying needs of the country. While according to the last report of the Commission unjust discrimination has been practically eliminated. The logical conclusion then, ladies and gentlemen, is that rates are more satisfactory in this country than elsewhere.

Our stand thus far this evening, ladies and gentlemen, is simply this: Government ownership is inexpedient, first, because it is not adaptable to American conditions, and secondly, because it would not improve rates and service on American railroads. For these reasons we maintain that government ownership of the Interstate Railways would be an inexpedient measure.

SECOND NEGATIVE, JOHN M. QUINLIVAN, CARLETON
COLLEGE '16

Ladies and Gentlemen: We of the negative argued in the first place this evening that government ownership of the railways is inexpedient, because it would be ineffective as a means of improving the rates or service on American railways, and because it would be poorly adapted to American conditions. But there are still more serious objections to the policy the affirmative are advocating. We object to government ownership in the second place because as a railway policy for the United States it is undesirable.

It is undesirable, first, because it would introduce political evils into the administration of railway affairs. One of the most serious of these evils would be the influence of the railway employees in politics. More than one million of the American railway employees are mem-

bers of the strongest labor organizations in the world. For years they have conducted a campaign against the railways for the purpose of furthering their own interests, and they have succeeded to so great an extent that to-day they are generally regarded as a most favored class of workingmen. Every new favor which they receive is a signal for further demands, and they have made it clear that these demands are to continue indefinitely.

Now under government ownership these men would become government employees and the purpose of their demands would then be the securing of favors from the government. Thus, these employees would necessarily become an organized factor in every political campaign. So long as the party in power kept on good terms with these men, it would have their support. And in order to prevent the loss of railway votes, the party in power would be forced to allow these organizations to dominate in matters relating to railway affairs.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is not a theoretical objection. The government is to-day experiencing the same evil in the rural free delivery service. When this branch of the postal service was first established, rural mail carriers received about \$400 annually for their work. They are unskilled and would receive no more for the same amount of work in other occupations. But their repeated demands upon the government have increased their wages to more than \$1200, and to-day Postmaster General Burleson actually recommends that the government have this work performed by contract in order to escape the political influence of the rural voters, which he

says is responsible for an annual loss of more than \$18,000,000. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if the rural mail carriers, poorly organized as they are, are able to exercise this power, what would prevent the railway employees, highly organized as they are, from actually dominating the railway situation? Civil service will not improve matters, for as former Senator Bourne of Oregon points out, the very fact that the chief officers of the party in power have direct control over the conditions and requirements of the civil service would make this anything but effective as a means of combating the evil.

But that is not the only serious political evil. Even if the administration of the railways were placed in the hands of a separate railway department, Congress would be the final authority in the extension and improvement of railways. And since Congress has always shown a tendency to make public improvements in a wasteful manner, what good reason is there for supposing that it would abandon that policy in the extension of railways? But that is not all. If railway extensions were made in accordance with a political policy, the section or community having the strongest representation in Congress would necessarily be the ones to receive favors, just as at present in other public improvements. Surely political influence in the extension of railways is an evil which it would be impossible to escape and one which would be seriously detrimental to the best interests of the railway service.

Government ownership of the railways is undesirable in the second place because it is objectionable from an

economic standpoint. Public railway operation would result in an enormous increase in operating expenses. Although the railway employees are now generally regarded as a favored class, the government would probably be forced to pay higher wages. An increase of only five per cent. in wages would mean a total increase in operating expenses of \$58,000,000 a year. The government would probably be forced to shorten the working day. A shortening of the working day from ten to eight hours would mean an increase in operating expenses of \$234,000,000 a year. Thus, leaving out of consideration the probable increase in operating expenses as a result of the increase in the number of employees, and the certain increase as a result of the political policy of the government in operating the railways, the total increase in operating expenses would amount to at least \$292,000,000 a year.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we do not believe that the paying of higher wages is in itself an altogether objectionable feature. If the organized railway employees were actually in need of higher wages and better conditions, and if the government could provide these without forcing an actual burden upon the general public, we would not be objecting to government railway ownership upon these grounds. But as a matter of fact, an overwhelming majority of the railway employees are to-day receiving high wages, and most important of all, the government would not effect economies which would offset the increase in operating expenses. If the government did away with every salary of every railway official and

clerk in the United States, which it certainly could not do, it would eliminate only two per cent. of operating expenses. If the government did away with all forms of railway advertising, which it certainly would not be wise in doing, it would eliminate only one-fiftieth of one per cent. of operating expenses. An increase of only a low percentage in wages would not offset any possible saving in the cost of capital. Wages constitute two-thirds of operating expenses, and a very slight increase in wages would offset any amount which the government would be likely to save. And if the government made no more attempt to effect economies than it does in the enterprises which it already conducts, there is little or no reason for assuming that it would even attempt to offset the increase in operating expenses. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, this increase in operating expenses, an increase which would have no connection with an improvement in the service, would be levied upon the people in the form of an added burden of taxation. Railway employees would be highly favored at the expense of their less favored fellow citizens; railway extensions would be granted to sections having the strongest political pull; and the people as a whole would bear the burden. Surely this is far from desirable in comparison with our present railway system.

Finally, the policy the affirmative are advocating is undesirable because these evils have become actually serious in countries where government railway ownership has been established. The Inter-colonial Railway of Canada, a government-owned line, is known far and wide as

"Canada's white elephant." F. C. R. Gordon, of the National Civic Federation, says that this road is politically operated and that as a result it costs more than seven thousand dollars a mile to operate it as against less than five thousand dollars on the privately owned Grand Trunk Railway. The Inter-colonial taps the rich coal and iron fields of Nova Scotia, has a complete rail monopoly of that traffic, and ought to be one of the best paying railways in Canada. As a matter of fact it is the worst paying railway in Canada. Prof. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, of the College of France, says that state ownership of the Western Railway of France has been accompanied by an enormous increase in operating expenses as a result of the influence of politics, and that this was accompanied by a deterioration in the service. Chief Railway Commissioner Johnson of Australia says that political manipulations have determined the location of a large number of the Australian lines, and that the losses to the public because of this policy has been enormous. The report of the new Italian railway commission says that state ownership of the Italian lines has resulted in an enormous increase in the number of employees, and that this has been accompanied by no improvement in the service. Yves Guyot, French minister of public works, says that on the government-owned Swiss railways political favoritism in various forms has increased operating expenses beyond all reason, and that in an attempt to offset this, the government has both increased the rates and lowered the standard of service. In view of the fact, then, ladies and gentlemen, that these evils

exist on the government railways in foreign countries and in view of the fact that government enterprise in the United States already exhibits the same general tendencies, we must conclude that as a railway policy for the United States it would be far from desirable.

Thus far in the debate, then, we have shown, first, that government ownership of the railways is inexpedient, because it is poorly adapted to American conditions, and because it would be ineffective as a means of improving the rates or service on American railways. Second, we have shown that it is undesirable, because it would introduce political evils, because it would introduce serious economic problems, and because these evils have become actually apparent in countries where government railway ownership has been established. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, we of the negative believe we are justified in the stand we have taken this evening. We believe that the government of the United States should not own and operate the interstate railways.

THIRD NEGATIVE, ROBERT L. CALHOUN, CARLETON
COLLEGE '15

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The negative first showed you this evening that government ownership of American railroads would be inexpedient because it is not well adapted to American conditions, and because it would not tend to improve either rates or service. We next showed that government ownership would be positively undesirable because of certain political defects which result in wasteful management. We shall

prove finally that government ownership is unnecessary.

The last speaker for the affirmative tried to prove at some length that government regulation is a failure. We disagree with the gentleman's conclusion on this point because commission regulation has proved a distinct success. The United States is the only country in the world which has tried regulation by a commission, and the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, therefore, was purely an experiment. The commission was forced to go about its new task of regulation without the guidance of foreign experience, and was forced to work out a regulative system by the tedious method of experimentation. Taking into account, therefore, the difficulty of the problem which the commission was called upon to solve, its success has been remarkable.

The most conspicuous achievement of the commission has been to provide for the American railway public the best railway rates and service in the world. My colleague has shown you that even the Prussian system, the most efficient system of government ownership and operation in existence, would be helpless to improve American railway service. The affirmative contention of unfair rates, based upon fictitious capitalization, deals with a condition which, as we shall prove later, can be remedied without resorting to government ownership. The commission, then, has successfully regulated rates and service. Furthermore, during twenty-seven years of commission regulation the risk of American railway travel has decreased by seventy-seven per cent., because of the extensive adoption of safety devices ordered by the

commission. Finally, rate discrimination, the most widespread evil under the old railway régime, is fast disappearing. Open discrimination was long ago weeded out, and secret rebating is rapidly yielding to the efforts of the commissioners. Thus, in securing good service at low rates, in providing for the safety of passengers and employees, and in removing rate discrimination, the regulative commission has proved a success.

But since our problem is to obtain the best possible method of conducting the railway business for the future, we contend in the second place that the system which has proved so successful in the past will be even more successful in the future. Our first reason for this belief has already been suggested. Commission regulation in the past has been essentially an experiment, because the commission was forced to solve problems which no other country had ever solved. The development of the American regulative policy, therefore, was necessarily slow. But the significant fact is this: with every successive amendment to the original interstate commerce law, the work of the commission reached a distinctly higher plane of efficiency, until to-day commission regulation has come to a point where we may expect consistently good work in the future.

The issue at this point between the affirmative and the negative is now clear. The affirmative desires to throw away this system of commission regulation, the product of twenty-seven years' work, and begin over again with government ownership. "The government," says the second speaker, "has solved new problems in the past,

and it can probably solve the new problems of government ownership." We of the negative hold that since commission regulation is proving successful, it is desirable rather to preserve this policy, the result of twenty-seven years of experiment under American conditions, rather than to burden the government with the task of working out a new system which is far less adaptable to the requirements of American politics and industry.

In standing thus for the principle of regulation as opposed to the principle of government ownership, we are not ignoring the evils which the gentlemen have enumerated. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized the existence of these evils and has suggested two changes in the interstate commerce law to remove them. The first of these changes is the legalization of railways pools—that is, of railway associations in which the traffic or the earnings of the roads are divided according to a stipulated percentage. Such associations were made illegal by the Sherman Anti-trust Act, and were positively forbidden by the original interstate commerce law, because up to 1887, when that law was passed, there had been no regulating power to prevent the pooled roads from charging excessive rates. Now, however, the Interstate Commerce Commission has explicit power to fix maximum rate limits, and the danger from this source is therefore gone.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, recognizing this change in the status of the railway business, has repeatedly recommended the legalization of pooling. The best economists in the country have agreed with the

commissioners in this stand because, in the first place, pooling would eliminate the waste incident to rate competition. Since each road in the association would be assured of its full share of the total earnings, it would no longer compete with neighboring roads by duplicating service or by circuitous hauling of freight, and thus the economic waste of rate competition would be eliminated. Furthermore, the Interstate Commerce Commission would see to it that the public would get the benefit of the saving thus effected in the form of lower railway rates, and the pools, in removing competitive waste, would thus benefit both the railways and the public.

In the second place, if pooling were legalized the new law to prevent railway consolidation would be made more effective. In the past, railways have combined in spite of legal prohibition for two reasons: first, the desire to eliminate waste and to secure monopoly of traffic furnished powerful motives to combine, and secondly, it was possible to evade the old anti-trust laws by interholding stock and by interlocking directorates. If pooling is now legalized, both these conditions will be changed. Pooling would eliminate waste without consolidation, and would at the same time make it unnecessary to combine for monopoly of traffic. Secondly, the Clayton Anti-trust law, passed in 1914, expressly forbids both interholding of stock and interlocking of directorates, thus cutting off the two paths by which the railways could once evade the law. Thus, legalized pooling would permit the effective control of consolidation by the Clayton Anti-trust law.

Finally, pooling is more desirable than consolidation under government ownership because it preserves desirable forms of competition which government ownership destroys. The first of these is industrial competition, or in technical language, "competition of markets." The railways which carry Minnesota or Alabama iron, for example, to manufacturing centers in the East are forced to give the faraway producers rates which enable them to compete with the producers of Pennsylvania. The operation of this force would obviously be as effective under a system of legalized pools as it is to-day. Secondly, the pooled railways would still compete for traffic by improving their service. Theoretically this is true because in the railway business increased traffic means larger proportional profit. Practically, as Professor Johnson of the Pennsylvania transportation department points out, "Agreements as to division of traffic or earnings have not prevented railway managers from seeking to attract business by improving their service." Thus, pooling permits the operation of desirable competitive forces and is, therefore, superior to consolidation under government ownership.

Now, in order that the commission may have all the power necessary for proper regulation of the railway pools, we suggest the addition of three restrictive measures to those already in force. The first is to compel all interstate railways to re-charter their business under federal law — in other words, to take out a federal charter. This measure has been advocated by both Professor Johnson of Pennsylvania and Professor Ely of Wis-

consin, the foremost American authorities on corporation control, because of its combined simplicity and effectiveness. It involves merely a transfer of the chartering function from the states to the federal government, yet it would give the government direct control over railway stock and bond issues, would effectually prevent stock speculation, and would make impossible the existence of fictitious capitalization. On the other hand, it would be advantageous to the railways themselves, for it would stabilize the value of their securities and would prevent the ruin of prosperous railways by stock manipulators.

The second suggested addition is to give the commission power to fix minimum rate limits, to specify a rate in certain cases below which a railway shall not charge. This power would enable the commission to remove discrimination due to unreasonably low rates as well as that due to unreasonably high rates. At the same time it would secure to the traffic managers the power to adapt their rate schedules to varying industrial conditions — a power which cannot be given under government ownership.

Finally, as a third change, we would give the commission a certain degree of constructive power — the power to compel railways to provide a reasonable standard of service. The Interstate Commerce Commission is already exercising such power in compelling the adoption of safety devices and steel cars, and the state commissions of Wisconsin and New York are successfully using even the power to order railway extensions and improve-

ments. Thus, for the sake of remedying specific abuses without resorting to government ownership, we favor the adoption of a federal incorporation act for interstate railways, to remove speculation and fictitious capitalization; the granting of power to fix minimum rate limits, as a further guard against discrimination; and a certain degree of constructive power to ensure proper railway service.

The system of railway control which we uphold is government regulation by a commission—a plan which twenty-seven years of experiment has brought to a high stage of efficiency. As a result of this long course of experimentation, the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended two changes in the interstate commerce law—the legalization of railway pools and the provision of added restrictions for the control of the pools. This recommendation we choose to follow out, because we believe the members of the commission are better fitted than any other men in the country to suggest improvements in the regulative machinery. Our fundamental aim in supporting this system is to provide a policy of railway control which includes neither free competition nor complete consolidation, thus avoiding the faults of either extreme position.

The negative argument this evening has established three chief contentions against government ownership. First, it is inexpedient because it is ill-adapted to American conditions and because it would improve neither rates nor service. Second, it is undesirable because it would put the management of the railways into the hands of

politicians and because this political management would be economically wasteful. Finally, it is unnecessary, because commission regulation has proved its efficiency in America and because it may be expected to prove even more successful in the future.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, THOMAS O. YOUNG, CARLETON COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have argued that government ownership of the railways is necessary to do away with high rates and have then proceeded to argue that rates are high because of fictitious capitalization. We do not believe that rates to-day are as high as the gentlemen would have you believe. Prof. W. Z. Ripley of Harvard, says that all economic authorities to-day agree that American railway rates are reasonable and the lowest in the world. But if such a condition does exist, that is, that rates are high due to fictitious capitalization, it will be entirely eliminated under the plan which my colleague has proposed; that of federal incorporation of all interstate railways. The gentlemen have argued that the railways to-day are receiving from sixteen to eighteen per cent. upon their real value and as authority for this radical statement have quoted Senator Thorne of Iowa. We would like to ask the gentlemen just what authority Senator Thorne of Iowa has for making such a statement in the face of the recent report of the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to the establishment of a commerce court. They here stated that, "The ratio of interest and divi-

dends to outstanding bonds and stocks of American railways is not quite four and one-half per cent. in each case." The only authority to-day in a position to know says that the railways are earning but four and one-half per cent. upon their capitalization. According to all recent physical valuations the physical valuation is actually in excess of the capitalization. The recent valuation taken of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad disclosed the remarkable fact that what was considered to be the worst over-capitalized road in the country was actually worth more than its capital stock. Five states have taken physical valuations of their railroads and in every case the cost of reproduction is far in excess of the capitalized value. Obviously, ladies and gentlemen, the government must take over the railroads at their physical value if it takes them at all. But as the physical value is not less than the capitalization and the railways are paying but four and one-half per cent. upon their capitalization the government could not charge less than the railways are charging and still make sufficient money to pay the interest on their debt. Thus, ladies, and gentlemen, though the affirmative have spent considerable time in arguing that rates to-day are too high they have failed fundamentally in showing that government ownership will improve the situation.

The affirmative have argued further, that government ownership is necessary to do away with political corruption. Upon this point the gentlemen fail to take into consideration the fact that during the past five years a movement has been on foot which has practically elimi-

nated the railways from politics. The railways themselves have abandoned the old political lobby and are depending upon different forms of publicity to put their case before the American people. They have established at Washington, the Bureau of Railway Economics for the prime purpose of giving to the people an accurate and unprejudiced view of the conditions and needs of the railways. This bureau is headed by no less a man than Prof. Logan G. McPherson of Johns Hopkins, generally conceded to be one of the best authorities on railroad questions. Where the railroads themselves have not adopted this new propaganda they have been forced into it by different forms of constructive legislation and direct popular government. Chief Justice Melvin of the California Supreme Court says that the once powerful influence of the Southern Pacific has been practically eliminated. While Senator La Follette says that the condition no longer exists in Wisconsin. Thus the argument of the gentlemen does not apply to conditions as they are to-day and is, therefore, of little weight.

In brief conclusion, we have answered the arguments of the affirmative and have shown that government ownership is not necessary to do away with high rates due to fictitious capitalization and further because the railway lobby and corrupt practice has been practically eliminated.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, JOHN M. QUINLIVAN,
CARLETON COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative in the course of their argument this evening have

taken exception to our second main contention. We argued that government ownership will introduce into the administration of railway affairs certain political and economic evils which have become so serious in foreign countries as to make extremely uncertain the success of the system. The gentlemen have not even as much as attempted to deny the existence of these evils in foreign countries, nor have they attempted to tell you that under ordinary conditions in this country they would fail to appear. But they have proposed a plan of their own for managing railway affairs, and they tell you that under the plan they are advocating the evils we have pointed out would be impossible. Now let us examine this plan briefly and see just what it amounts to.

They tell us that they will have the railway business of the country in the hands of a commission appointed by the President. These together with the other higher railway officials will be appointed for life and will hold office during good behavior. The other railway employees will be subject to strict civil service requirements. Now, certainly this is a very simple proposition, but would it accomplish the things which the gentlemen of the affirmative claim for it?

We pointed out in the first place that under government railway ownership the demands of the organizations of railway labor which are now directed at the private railway corporations would be directed at the government. How would the plan of the affirmative make this impossible? In the next place we pointed out that these labor organizations would make exorbitant demands upon the

government just as they now do upon the private railway corporations. How would the plan of the affirmative make this impossible? Next, we pointed out that the party in power, in order to prevent the loss of railway votes, would allow the employees practically to dominate in matters relating to railway affairs. How would the plan of the affirmative prevent this evil? What is there about their system which would prevent the railway labor unions from using their influence against the party in power in case their demands were not granted? Next, we argued that the government in managing the railway system would pursue a wasteful policy just as it does at the present time in managing other industrial enterprises and in making other public improvements. How would the plan of the affirmative prevent this evil? What is there about their plan which would deprive Congress of its constitutional right to order extensions and improvements, and to appropriate money for that purpose? Certainly, the gentlemen of the affirmative are going altogether too far when they say that under the plan they are proposing, the evils we have pointed out would be impossible.

The gentlemen have spent no small amount of time in telling us of the political evils which exist under the present system. They would have us believe that the railways of the United States are exerting a tremendous influence for evil, and that the only way to prevent the political influence of the railways is to take them out of private hands and place them in the hands of the government.

Now we shall not attempt to deny that in the past the railways have exerted some political influence; neither do we deny that to some extent they exercise that influence at the present time. But the gentlemen have overlooked the fact that the evil which they tell us about is becoming less and less serious every year. The spread of government and corporate reform throughout the United States has already gone far toward eliminating the evils which were once caused by the influence of the railways in politics. The direct primaries have in a great many localities made it impossible for the railways to control party nominations through the old convention system, and it was by controlling conventions that the railways once exercised political power. In place of the old legislative lobbies which once played so great a part in railway affairs the railroads are inaugurating a campaign of education for the purpose of laying their case before the public. The corrupting influence of the railways in politics is growing weaker every year, and government railway ownership is no longer necessary to remove it.

The affirmative have made much of the fact that the present system of railway regulation implies a conflict between the railways and the regulative agencies, and they say that the only way in which this conflict may be eliminated is for the government to own and operate the railways. But is that a valid argument for government railway ownership? Perhaps this conflict does exist, but what if it does? Government railway ownership would not improve matters. The railways must be regulated, no matter whether they are owned by government or by pri-

vate corporations. Under the present system the government must regulate the private railways in order to make them satisfactory to the public. Under government ownership it would have to regulate them in order to make them satisfactory to the public. And until the gentlemen of the affirmative can show us that the conflict of the government with the railways is greater than the conflict of the general public with the government when it wants favors from the government, we can hardly be expected to see the logic of their contention. The railways will cause conflicts and problems of regulation under any system, and the mere fact that a conflict exists at the present time is no argument whatever for the adoption of government ownership.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, we still believe we are justified in maintaining that government railway ownership would introduce new evils of its own, and that it is not the proper remedy for the evils which may exist in the present system.

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, ROBERT L. CALHOUN, CARLETON
COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The negative first proved that government ownership of the American railways would be inexpedient because it is poorly adapted to American conditions and because it would improve neither rates nor service. The gentlemen of the affirmative reply by saying that the regulative activity of the government is increasing. We agree with them, but such argument does not weaken our position: it is in the direc-

tion of government regulation of private industry, not of publicly owned and publicly operated industry, that the activity of the American government lies. As for the argument of unfair rates, based on fictitious capitalization, we have shown how that abuse can be eliminated without resorting to government ownership.

We proved secondly that government ownership would be undesirable because it would introduce political and economic evils into the system of railway management. The gentlemen flatly deny that these evils would appear under their new plan, but my colleague showed that the affirmative plan, ingenious as it is, would not prevent politics from controlling the railway situation.

The third point at issue this evening is whether government ownership is necessary — that is, whether government ownership is a better method of railway control than commission regulation. At this point the burden of proof lies clearly with the gentlemen of the affirmative. Yet the gentlemen have made no attempt to prove that government ownership would remedy the evils they have mentioned more effectively than would government regulation, with the mechanical improvements suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Now if commission regulation can remove the evils, there is no reason for adopting government ownership. Thus the only fair way to prove the superiority of government ownership is to make a detailed comparison of the two systems, taking into account the specific mechanical improvements incorporated in the system we uphold. Such a comparison the gentlemen have not ventured to make, and it is by no means suf-

ficient that the last speaker shall make a general statement to the effect that government regulation has failed. Neither can he discount our arguments for commission regulation by saying that government ownership is simply the highest form of regulation, for government regulation never can become government ownership without losing its essential character as regulation. When the efficient management and the flexible rates of private ownership are replaced by the wasteful management and the rigid rates of public ownership, then it is sheer mockery to call the resulting system government regulation. Thus, the affirmative case is far from complete, since the gentlemen have utterly failed to show by a detailed comparison that government ownership is a better system than commission regulation.

Let us now compare the opposing systems and see which is superior. The first reason the affirmative gave for adopting government ownership was that the railways are corrupting politics. My colleague has shown that this contention is largely imaginary, for excepting a few scattered instances, political corruption is rapidly disappearing under the attacks of popular government. On the other hand, the political evils of government ownership are inherent in the system itself, and cannot be eradicated by any external restrictive force. Thus from the standpoint of pure politics, private ownership is preferable to public ownership.

The second evil which the gentlemen deplored is stock speculation. Now we readily concede that government ownership would reduce the amount of speculation in rail-

way stock, but on the other hand we have shown that it can be reduced without resort to government ownership by federal incorporation. Wall Street to-day has no power to manipulate the stock of national banks, the only important corporations which now hold federal charters. And since federal incorporation, as a supplement to commission regulation, can deal with speculation as effectively as can government ownership, it is not necessary to adopt government ownership to prevent stock manipulation.

The third evil the gentlemen mentioned was unfair rates, based upon fictitious capitalization. My first colleague has shown that government ownership could not remove this evil without creating a huge deficit for the government. On the other hand federal incorporation, by giving the government control over stock and bond issues, will make the existence of fictitious capital utterly impossible. The affirmative may say in general terms that regulation is ineffective, but they can scarcely deny that the specific remedial measure we suggest would prevent false stock issue.

In removing unjust discrimination, government ownership has proved a pitiful failure. Prof. Hugo R. Meyer of Chicago points to flagrant cases of unjust discrimination in Germany, in Australia, and on the state roads in France, to show that government ownership appears actually to foster such discrimination. On the other hand, the gentlemen of the affirmative have not found one single instance of unjust discrimination under the American system which they have ventured to use in their case against regulation. For commission regulation, as we have

shown, is rapidly eliminating unjust discrimination from the railway system.

Finally, the system of government regulation ensures far superior operating efficiency. My colleagues have shown you the frightfully poor business methods which have characterized government operation of railways in various parts of the world: methods which increased the operating expenses on the French Western railway by forty per cent. in three years; methods which raised the labor expenses on the Swiss roads by fifty-one per cent. in six years; methods which wasted \$40,000,000 in four years of construction work on the Canadian Transcontinental road, and which finally forced the abandonment of the project because of government inefficiency. Government regulation retains the economy of private operation and thus ensures economical management.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, we have on the one hand government ownership, a system which is ill-adapted to American conditions and which could improve neither rates nor service; on the other, commission regulation, a system perfectly adapted to American conditions and a system which is improving rates and service every year. Government ownership is invariably accompanied by inherent political dangers and by wasteful management; commission regulation is rapidly removing the private railways from politics, and assures economical management. Government ownership does not provide an effective remedy for the very evils which the affirmative has pointed out; commission regulation, supplemented by a few mechanical changes in the interstate commerce law,

furnishes an effective method of removing the evils. Thus we maintain our original position — that commission regulation rather than government ownership is the proper method of controlling the American railways.

APPENDICES

List of Colleges and Universities Engaging in Forensic Contests During the School Year of 1914-15, with Names of Coaches, Managers of Debate, and Statement of Questions, Record of Decisions, etc., Arranged Alphabetically by States.

APPENDIX I

ALABAMA

Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Auburn. Non-sectarian. No report 1915. Triangular — University of Georgia, and North Carolina Agricultural College. See Georgia.

Annual Debate — See Tulane University, Louisiana.

University of Alabama. Tuscaloosa. Non-sectarian. No report 1915. Triangular — Vanderbilt University, Tenn., and University of Kentucky. See Vanderbilt.

ARKANSAS

Hendrix College. Conway. Meth. Episcopal South. Coach — Prof. C. J. Greene. Manager — M. T. Workman. Manager 1914-15 — J. H. Bishop.

Annual Debate — Central College, Fayette, Mo. Two on team. Date — April 16, 1915. Place — Fayette, Missouri. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abolished. Decision — 2 to 1 for Central Affirmative.

Ouachita College. Arkadelphia. Baptist. Coach — Homer L. Grice. Manager 1915 — Clarence Hooper.

Annual Debate — Centenary College, Shreveport, La. Two on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Place — Shreveport, La. Question, Resolved, that the women of the United States should be given the privilege of equal suffrage. Decision — Ouachita Affirmative 3, Centenary Negative 0.

Annual Debate — Union College, Jackson, Tenn. Two on Team. Date — April 30, 1915. Place — Arkadelphia. Question — Resolved, that through appropriate legislation a minimum wage scale should be introduced in the United States. (Constitutionality conceded.) Decision — Union Affirmative 1, Ouachita Negative 2.

University of Arkansas. Fayetteville. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach—none. Manager 1914-15—J. D. Henry.

Triangular—with Univ. of Louisiana and Univ. of Texas. Two on teams. Date—April 9, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the several states should adopt a minimum wage law for unskilled workers. Decisions—At Fayetteville, Arkansas Affirmative 2, Texas Negative 1. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Affirmative 2, Arkansas Negative 1. At Austin, Texas Affirmative 2, Louisiana Negative 1.

Annual Debate—University of Oklahoma, Norman. Two on team. Date—April 12, 1915. Place—Norman, Okla. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate the telegraph system. Decision—Oklahoma Affirmative 1, Arkansas Negative 2.

CALIFORNIA

Leland Stanford University. Palo Alto. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Coach—Karl E. Lieb. Manager 1914-15—Albert F. Coyle. Manager 1916—Karl E. Lieb.

Triangular—Universities of Oregon and Washington at Eugene and Seattle. Two on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Question—Resolved that the federal government should own and operate all railroads acting as common carriers, including all interstate lines competing with them. Decisions—At Palo Alto, Stanford Affirmative 2, Oregon Negative 1. At Seattle, University of Washington Affirmative 1, Stanford Negative 2. At Eugene, Oregon Affirmative, Washington Negative. No report.

Annual Debate—University of California, Berkeley. Three on team. Date—Nov. 21, 1914. Place—San Francisco. Question—Resolved, that California should abolish state-wide initiative and referendum. Decision—Stanford Affirmative 0, California Negative 3.

Annual Carnot Debate—University of California, Berkeley. (Extempore Debate.) Three on teams—two Stanford and one California, and two California and one Stanford composing the teams. A medal is given the best debater.

Date — April 9, 1915. Place — Palo Alto. Question — Resolved, that the teachers in the primary schools of France should be appointed by a communal authority. (Note: This question was assigned to the contestants from the general subject, "The Educational System of France," two hours before the time for debate, making it a genuine extemporaneous debate.) Winner — J. F. Elden, Jr., Stanford.

Occidental College. Los Angeles. Presbyterian. No coach. Prof. Hubert G. Shearin in charge. Manager 1915 — Millard Mier. Manager 1916 — Clifford Barrett.

Triangular — Pomona College, Claremont and University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Three on teams. Date — March 27, 1915. Question — Resolved, that in California land values should be the only subject of taxation for state and local purposes. Decisions — At Occidental, Occidental Affirmative 1, Pomona Negative 2. At U. S. C., U. S. C. Affirmative 1, Occidental Negative 2. At Claremont, Pomona Affirmative 1, U. S. C. Negative 2.

Annual Debate — Whittier College, Whittier, Calif. Two on team. Date — —. Place — Whittier. Question — Resolved, that the Supreme Court should be denied the right to annul an act of Congress. Decision — Occidental Affirmative 3, Whittier Negative 0.

Annual Debate (Women) — Univ. of So. California, Los Angeles. Date — April 29, 1915. Place — Occidental College. Question — Resolved, that in the United States war should be declared only by a referendum vote of the people. Decision — Occidental Affirmative 1, U. S. C. Negative 2.

Pomona College. Claremont. Congregational. Coach 1914-15 — Paul A. Davies. Coach 1915-16 — Fred N. Edwards. Manager 1915 — E. P. Marsh.

Triangular — See Occidental College immediately above.

Dual Debate (Freshmen) — University of So. California Freshmen. Two on teams. Date — Jan., 1915. Question — Preferential ballot. Decisions — At Claremont,

Pomona Affirmative o, U. S. C. Negative 3. At Los Angeles, U. S. C. Affirmative 1, Pomona Negative 2.

Annual Debate (Freshmen) — University of Redlands Freshmen, Redlands, Calif. Three on teams. Date — May, 1915. Place — Claremont. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abolished. Decision — Pomona Affirmative 2, Redlands Negative 1.

Throop College of Technology. Pasadena. Non-sectarian. No coach. Manager, 1914-16 — Norman Prosser.

Annual Debate — U. S. C. Freshmen, Los Angeles. (See Univ. of So. California above.)

University of California. Berkeley. Non-sectarian. Coach — Newton B. Drury. Manager — Chairman of Debating Council.

Annual Debate. (See Leland Stanford above.)

Annual Carnot Debate. (See Leland Stanford above.)

University of Redlands. Redlands. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. Egbert Ray Nichols, English Dept., in charge. Manager 1915 — William Geistweit. Manager 1916 — Arthur Jacobsen.

Annual Debate — University of So. California Freshmen, Los Angeles. Two on team. Date — May, 1915. Place — Redlands. Question — Resolved, that government ownership would be the best method of building up the American merchant marine. Decision — U. S. C. Freshmen Affirmative 3, Redlands Negative o.

Annual Debate — Pomona College, Claremont. (Freshmen Debate.) (See Pomona College above.)

University of Southern California. Los Angeles: Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. (Law School — Tau Kappa Alpha.) Coach — Law School — A. W. Olmstead. Coach — University — Jay L. Chesnutt. Manager 1914-16 — Emory E. Olson.

Triangular. (See Occidental College above.)

Dual Debate. (See Pomona College above.)

Annual Debate (Freshman). (See University of Redlands above.)

Annual Debate (Women). (See Occidental College above.)

Annual Debate—Throop College of Technology (Freshman of U. S. C.), Pasadena. Two on team. Date—March, 1915. Place—Pasadena. Question—Resolved, that government ownership would be the best method of building up the American merchant marine. Decision—U. S. C. Freshmen 2, Throop Negative 1.

Annual Debate—Los Angeles Junior College (Freshmen). Two on team. Date—Feb., 1915. Place—L. A. High School. Question—Resolved, that government ownership would be the best method of building up the American merchant marine. Decision—U. S. C. Affirmative 3, Los Angeles Junior College 0.

Annual Debate. (See Brigham Young University, Utah.)

Annual Debate. (See N. Dakota Agricultural College.)

Whittier College. Whittier. Friends. Dr. H. T. Allen, Eng. Dept., in charge. Manager 1914-16—Harry C. Reid. No report 1915.

Annual Debate—Occidental College. (See Occidental above.)

COLORADO

Colorado Agricultural College. Ft. Collins. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Alfred Westfall, Coach. Manager—B. F. Coen.

Triangular Debate—Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan, and Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater. Two on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that all able-bodied men in the United States should be compelled to serve one year of compulsory military service before attaining the age of twenty-five. Decisions—At Ft. Collins, Colorado Affirmative 2, Kansas Negative 1. At Stillwater, Oklahoma Affirmative 3, Colorado Negative 0. At Manhattan, Kansas Affirmative 2, Oklahoma Negative 1.

Annual Debate—University of Wyoming, Laramie. Two on teams. Date—April 20, 1915. Place—Laramie. Question—Resolved, that all able-bodied men in the United States should be compelled to serve one year of compulsory military service before attaining the age of twenty-

five. Decision — Colorado Affirmative 1, Wyoming Negative 2.

Colorado College. Colorado Springs. Non-sectarian. J. W. Park, Coach. Manager 1914-15 — J. S. Hall. No report 1915.

Annual Debate — University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (See Univ. of Denver.)

Annual Debate. (See William Jewell College, Missouri.)

University of Colorado. Boulder. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Triangular — Universities of Kansas and Oklahoma. (See under those states.)

Triangular — Universities of Missouri and Texas. (See under those states.)

Annual Debate — University of Utah. (See Utah.)

University of Denver. Denver. Methodist Episcopal. Tau Kappa Alpha. Coach — Perle Shale Kingsley. Manager 1914-15 — Holbrook Working. Manager 1915-16 — Terrence Allsworth.

Annual Debate — Colorado College, Colorado Springs. Three on teams. Date — March 19, 1915. Place — Colorado Springs. Question — Resolved, that the only elective officers of the state government of Colorado should be a commission of fifteen qualified electors in whom shall reside all legislative powers, a state auditor, and a governor, who, with his appointed cabinet, shall exercise all executive powers. Decision — Colorado College Affirmative 1, Univ. of Denver Negative 2.

Annual Debate — University of So. Calif. Law School, Los Angeles, Calif. Two on teams. Date — March 25, 1915. Place — Los Angeles. Question — Resolved, that the judges of all courts of general and appellate jurisdiction, other than federal courts, should not gain office by popular vote. Decision — U. S. C. Law Affirmative 3, Univ. of Denver Negative 0.

Annual Debate — Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina. Two on teams. Date — April 23, 1915. Place — Denver. Question — Resolved, that the United States should adopt a unicameral form of legislature. Decision — Univ. of

Denver Affirmative 1, Kansas Wesleyan Negative 2.
 Annual Debate—Utah Agricultural College, Logan. Two on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Place—Logan, Utah. Question—Resolved, that the judges of all courts of general and appellate jurisdiction, other than federal courts, should gain office by some means other than popular vote. Decision—Utah Agricultural Affirmative 3, Univ. of Denver Negative 0.

Annual Debate—University of Wyoming, Laramie. Three on teams. Date—May 6, 1915. Place—Denver. Question—Resolved, that all able-bodied male citizens of the United States should be required to perform one year's military service before the age of twenty-five. (Interpretation—At least three hours a day must be spent in study or training in military subjects and at least three months of the year must be spent "with the colors." The right of the affirmative to substitute naval for other military training is granted.) Decision—Univ. of Wyoming Affirmative 2, Univ. of Denver Negative 1.

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College, Hartford. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See New York University.)

Wesleyan University. Middletown. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Triangular—Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., and Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. No report 1915.

Triangular—Bowdoin College, Maine, and Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (See under Maine and New York.)

Yale University. New Haven. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. J. C. Adams, faculty member in charge. Manager 1914-15—Philip Owen Badger. Manager 1915-16—Raymond Dudley.

Triangular—Harvard and Princeton universities. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the best interests of the United States demand a prompt and substantial increase in the army and navy. Decisions—At New Haven, Yale Affirmative 3, Harvard Negative 0. At Princeton, Princeton Affirmative 0, Yale

Negative 3. At Cambridge, Harvard Affirmative, Princeton Negative. No report.

Annual Debate—Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. Three on teams. Date—December 18, 1914. Place—New Haven. Question—Resolved, that nation wide prohibition is desirable in the United States, either by federal regulation or by state regulation, or by both. Decision—Syracuse Affirmative o, Yale Negative 3.

Annual Debate (Freshmen)—Syracuse University. Three on teams. Date—Dec. 18, 1914. Place—Syracuse. Question—Prohibition, as stated in preceding debate. Decision—Yale Affirmative o, Syracuse Negative 3.

Freshman Triangular—Princeton and Harvard universities. Three on teams. Date—May 7, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions—At New Haven, Harvard Affirmative o, Yale Negative 3. At Princeton, Yale Affirmative 1, Princeton Negative 2. At Cambridge, Princeton Affirmative, Harvard Negative. No report.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Georgetown University. Washington. Catholic. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Boston College, Mass.)

George Washington University. Washington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Howard University. Washington. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. Montgomery Gregory. Manager—H. H. Donald. Manager 1915-16—J. W. Love.

Triangular—Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga., and Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. Two on teams. Date—April 7, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should guarantee immediately independence to the Philippines to take effect within ten years. Decision—At Washington, Howard Affirmative 2, Atlanta Negative 1. At Nashville, Fisk Affirmative 1, Howard Negative 2. At Atlanta, Atlanta Affirmative 3, Fisk Negative o.

Annual Debate—College Men's Round Table, New York City. Three on teams. Date—May 7, 1915. Place—

New York City. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately make a material increase in its army and navy. Decision—Howard Affirmative 1, College Men's Round Table Negative 2.

GEORGIA

Atlanta University. Atlanta. Non-sectarian. Coach—Prof. George A. Towns. Manager 1914-15—John P. Whitaker. Manager 1915-16—Asa H. Gordon.

Triangular—Howard University, Washington, D. C., and Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn. (See Howard University in District of Columbia section immediately above.)

Emory College. Oxford, Ga. Methodist Episcopal South. G. C. White, Sec. Debate Council 1915-16.

Annual Debate—Davidson College, Davidson, N. Carolina. Two on teams. Date—April 12, 1915. Place—Decatur, Ga. Question—Resolved, that an alliance of all American countries should take the place of the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Davidson College Affirmative 2, Emory Negative 1.

Annual Debate—Furman University, Greenville, S. Carolina. Two on teams. Date—April 24, 1915. Place—Oxford, Ga. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied should be definitely abandoned as a part of the foreign policy of the United States. Decision—Emory Affirmative 2, Furman Negative 1.

Mercer University. Macon. Baptist. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Baylor University, Texas.)

Annual Debate. (See Furman University, S. Carolina.)

University of Georgia. Athens. Non-sectarian. No coach. E. B. Dunlap, Chairman Debate Council.

Triangular—Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, and No. Carolina Agricultural and Mechanical College, W. Raleigh, N. Carolina. Date—April 23, 1915. Question—Resolved that the agricultural interests of the South would be subserved by bringing foreign immigration to the South. Decisions—At Athens, Ga., Georgia Affirmative 2, Alabama Poly. Negative 1. At West Raleigh, N. C., North Carolina A. & M. Affirmative 0, Georgia Negative

3. At Auburn, Ala., Alabama Poly. Affirmative vs. N. Carolina Negative. No report.

Triangular—University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., and University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C. Two on teams. Date—May 1, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all railroads (steam and electric) engaged in interstate commerce. Decisions—At Columbia, Tennessee Affirmative 2, Georgia Negative 1. At Knoxville, Tenn., Georgia Affirmative 0, South Carolina Negative 3. At Athens, Ga., South Carolina Affirmative 0, Tennessee Negative 3.

IDAHO

University of Idaho. Moscow. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Dual Debate. (See Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.)

Annual Debate. (See Utah Agricultural College.)

ILLINOIS

Augustana College. Rock Island. Lutheran. Prof. A. E. Keiber, Coach. Manager 1915—Evan Anderson. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Illinois College.)

Carthage College. Carthage. Lutheran. No report 1915.

Triangular—Hedding College, and William and Vashti. (See William and Vashti.)

Eureka College. Eureka. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. President H. O. Pritchard, in charge.

Triangular—James Milliken University, Decatur, Ill., and Illinois Wesleyan, Bloomington. Three on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the State of Illinois should adopt a system of single tax based on rental values. Decisions—At Eureka, Eureka Affirmative 3, Milliken Negative 0. At Bloomington, Illinois Wesleyan 1, Eureka Negative 2. At Decatur, Milliken Affirmative vs. Illinois Wesleyan. No report.

Hedding College. Abingdon. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Triangular—Carthage College, and William and Vashti College. (See William and Vashti.)

Illinois College. Jacksonville. Presbyterian. No coach. Manager 1915—Roy H. Bracewell.

Triangular—Augustana College. Rock Island, and Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1912. Question—Resolved, that labor organizations should be exempt from the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. (Constitutionality waived.) Decisions—At Jacksonville, Illinois Affirmative 2, Augustana Negative 1. At Monmouth, Monmouth Affirmative 3, Illinois Negative 0. At Rock Island, Augustana Affirmative 0, Monmouth Negative 3.

Illinois Wesleyan. Bloomington. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. P. C. Somerville, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Eureka College, Illinois.)

James Milliken. Decatur. Presbyterian. H. G. Seldomridge, Coach. Manager, 1915—Leo Graybill. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Eureka College, Illinois.)

Knox College. Galesburg. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Dwight E. Watkins, Professor of Public Speaking, in charge. Manager 1915—D. E. Watkins.

Dual Debate—Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. Three on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should form an alliance with the A. B. C. League to settle international differences of Latin America. Decisions—At Galesburg, Knox Affirmative 0, Beloit Negative 1. At Beloit, Beloit Affirmative 3, Knox Negative 0.

Monmouth College. Monmouth. United Presbyterian. M. M. Maynard and Arthur Andrews in charge. Manager—Arthur Andrews.

Triangular—Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., and Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. (See Illinois College above.)

Northwestern College. Naperville. Evangelical. Prof. Edward N. Himmel, in charge. Manager 1915—Paul Berger. Manager 1916—Allen Nickel.

Triangular—Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia., and Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. Three on teams. Date—April 23, 1915. Question—Resolved, that all interstate railroads should be owned and operated by the federal government. Decisions—At Naperville, Coe Affirmative 0, Northwestern Negative 3. At Ripon, Affirmative, Northwestern 2, Ripon Negative 1. At Cedar Rapids, Ripon Affirmative 0, Coe Negative 3.

Northwestern University. Evanston. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. James L. Lardner, Coach and Manager. Clarion D. Hardy, assistant.

Triangular—Chicago University and Michigan University. (See Univ. of Michigan.)

Annual Freshman Debate—University of Chicago. No report 1915.

University of Chicago. Chicago. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Howard Glenn Moulton, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Triangular—Northwestern University, Evanston, Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. (See Michigan University.)

Annual Freshman Debate. (See Northwestern College.)

University of Illinois. Urbana. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Charles H. Woolbert, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Pentangular. (See Iowa University and Minnesota University.)

William and Vashti College. Aledo. Non-sectarian. Leila M. Swarts, Coach and Manager.

Triangular—Hedding College, Abingdon, Ill., and Carthage College, Carthage, Ill. Three on teams. Date—April 9, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the federal government should enact uniform marriage and divorce laws, operative throughout the United States, granting exclusive jurisdiction to federal courts. Decisions—At Aledo, William and Vashti Affirmative 2, Hedding Negative 1. At Carthage, Carthage Affirmative 1, William and

Vashti Negative 2. At Abingdon, Hedding Affirmative
3, Carthage Negative 0.

INDIANA

Butler College. Indianapolis. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. H. B. Stout, Coach. Address—Lemcke Bldg., Indianapolis. Manager 1915—Bruce Robinson.

Annual Debate—Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. Three on teams. Date—April 9, 1915. Place—Indianapolis. Question—Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate public service telephone and telegraph lines. Decision—Butler Affirmative 2, Wabash Negative 1.

DePauw University. Greencastle. Methodist Episcopal. Tau Kappa Alpha. Prof. H. B. Gough, in charge. Edward Troxel, Assistant. No report 1915.

Earlham College. Richmond. Friends. E. P. Trueblood, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Annual Debate—Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana. (See below.)

Indiana University. Bloomington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Ralph Richman, Coach. No report 1915.

Dual Debate—Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. (See under Ohio.)

Indiana State Normal. Terre Haute. Non-sectarian. C. Baldwin Bacon, Coach. No report 1915.

Triangular Illinois State Normal, Normal, and Oshkosh Normal, Oshkosh, Wis. No report 1915.

Notre Dame University. Notre Dame. R. Catholic. W. A. Bogler, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Wabash College. Crawfordsville. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Clarence Thurber, Prof. Public Speaking, in charge. Manager—J. H. Moffat.

Annual Debate. (See Butler College, Indiana.)

Annual Debate—Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. Three on team. Date—April 9, 1915. Place—Crawfordsville. Question, Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate the public service telephone and telegraph lines. Decision—Wabash Affirmative 0, Earlham

Negative 3. (Wabash reports a triangular with Earlham and Butler. Butler reports a debate with Wabash only.)

IOWA

Buena Vista. Storm Lake. W. I. Easly, Coach. Manager 1915—Miss Evelyn Ensign.

Triangular—Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, Ia., and Central College, Pella, Ia. Three on teams. Date—February 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should retain the Philippines as a permanent possession. Decisions—At Storm Lake, Buena Vista Affirmative 1, Ellsworth Negative 2. At Pella, Central College Affirmative 0, Buena Vista Negative 3. At Iowa Falls, Ellsworth Affirmative 3, Central Negative 0.

Central College. Pella. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. Prof. J. D. Dodson in charge.

Triangular—Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, and Buena Vista College, Storm Lake. (See Buena Vista immediately above.)

Coe College. Cedar Rapids. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular—Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill., and Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. See under Illinois and Wisconsin.

Triangular—See Iowa Teachers' College.

Cornell College. Mt. Vernon. Methodist Episcopal. Prof. A. S. Keister, Coach. Manager 1915—L. B. Duke. Manager 1916—Don C. Kreger.

Dual Debate—Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. Three on teams. Date—March 17, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should form an alliance with the A. B. C. League to adjust international difficulties of Latin America. Decisions—At Mt. Vernon, Beloit Affirmative 0, Cornell Negative 3. At Beloit, Cornell Affirmative 0, Beloit Negative 3.

Des Moines College. Des Moines. Baptist. Mrs. F. T. Stephenson, Eng. Dept. in charge. C. Darrow, Manager 1915. Albert Jensen, Manager 1916.

Triangular—Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia., and Parsons Col-

lege, Fairfield, Ia. Two on teams. Date—Feb. 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all railroads within the United States. Decisions—At Des Moines, Des Moines Affirmative 1, Penn Negative 2. At Fairfield, Parsons Affirmative 3, Des Moines Negative 0. At Oskaloosa, Penn Affirmative 3, Parsons Negative 0.

Drake University. Des Moines. Non-sectarian. Frank E. Brown, Prof. of Public Speaking. Manager 1915—George Walters. No report 1915.

Triangular—Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia., and Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. (See under S. Dakota.)

Ellsworth College. Iowa Falls. No report 1915.

Triangular—Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Ia., and Central College, Pella, Ia. (See Buena Vista College above.)

Grinnell College. Grinnell. Non-sectarian. No report 1915. Triangular—Drake University, Des Moines, Ia., and Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion. (See under S. Dakota.)

Annual Debate. (See Macalester College, Minnesota.)

Highland Park College. Des Moines. Presbyterian. Pi Kappa Delta. H. M. Mumford, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Dual Debate. (See Iowa Teachers' College.)

Iowa State College. Ames. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Triangular—Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion and Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan. (See under Kansas and South Dakota.)

Iowa State Teachers' College. Cedar Falls. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. John Barnes, Coach and Manager.

Triangular—Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Ia., and Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia. Three on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all interstate railways. Decisions—At Cedar Falls, Iowa State Teachers' Affirmative 1, Coe Negative 2. At Sioux City, Morningside Affirmative 3, Iowa State Teachers' Negative 0. At Cedar Rapids, Coe Affirmative 2, Morningside Negative 1.

Dual—Highland Park, Des Moines, Ia. Three on team.

Date—Dec. 14, 1914. Question—Resolved, that a bench of judges should be substituted for the present jury in the trial of both civil and criminal cases. Decisions—At Cedar Falls, Iowa Teachers' College Affirmative, Highland Park Negative. At Des Moines, Highland Park Affirmative, Iowa Teachers' Negative.

Iowa Wesleyan. Mt. Pleasant. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Simpson College, Ia.)

Leander Clark College. Toledo. United Brethren. No report 1915.

Morningside College. Sioux City. Methodist. Prof. Charles A. Marsh, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Iowa Teachers' College.)

Dual Debate (Women). (See Simpson College, Ia.)

Annual Debate—Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans. (See under Kansas.)

Parsons College. Fairfield. Presbyterian. No report 1915.

Triangular—Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia., and Des Moines College, Ia. (See Des Moines above.)

Penn College. Oskaloosa. Friends. H. L. Morris, Coach 1915. W. C. Dennis, Coach and Manager 1916.

Triangular—Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia., and Des Moines College, Ia. (See Des Moines College.)

Simpson College. Indianola. Methodist Episcopal. Levi P. Goodwin, Coach and Manager 1915. Manager 1916—Raymond Sayre.

Triangular—Iowa Wesleyan, Mt. Pleasant, and Upper Iowa, Fayette. Three on teams. Date—March 12, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the short ballot should be adopted in state, county and municipal elections. Decisions—At Indianola, Simpson Affirmative 2, Iowa Wesleyan Negative 1. At Fayette, Upper Iowa Affirmative 3, Simpson Negative 0. At Mt. Pleasant—no report.

Dual Debate (Women)—Morningside College, Sioux City. Three on teams. Date—April 20, 1915. Question—Resolved, that, constitutionality granted, the federal government should prohibit interstate traffic in goods produced wholly or partly by child labor. Decisions—At Indian-

ola, Simpson Affirmative 3, Morningside Negative 0. At Sioux City, Morningside Affirmative 0, Simpson Negative 3.

University of Iowa. Iowa City. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Leonard Racker, Coach and Manager.

Pentangular — Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Nebraska universities. In 1914 Iowa met Illinois and Minnesota. Three on teams. Date — Dec. 12, 1914. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt a schedule of minimum wages for unskilled labor. Decisions — At Iowa City, Iowa Affirmative vs. Illinois Negative (2 to 1 but winning side not reported). At Minneapolis, Minnesota Affirmative 3, Iowa Negative 0.

Upper Iowa College. Fayette. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Simpson College, Ia.)

KANSAS

Baker University. Baldwin. Methodist Episcopal. Alfred E. Leach, Coach. Secretary of Debating Council manages. No report 1915.

Triangular — Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas, and Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas. See Ottawa University.

Bethany College. Lindsborg. Lutheran. No report 1915.

Bethel College. Newton. No report 1915. (See Cooper College.)

College of Emporia. Emporia. Presbyterian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Southwestern College, Kansas.)

Annual Debate (Women). (See Ottawa University, Kansas.)

Annual Debate. (See Kansas Normal.)

Cooper College. Sterling. United Presbyterian. S. A. Wilson, Coach. Manager 1915 — Robert I. Calderwood.

Annual Debate — McPherson College, McPherson, Kans. Two on teams. Date — April 2, 1915. Place — Sterling, Kans. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed by the United States should be maintained and made effective as a part of our foreign policy. Decision — Cooper Affirmative 2, McPherson Negative 1.

Annual Debate—Kansas City University. Two on teams.

Date—April 19, 1915. Place—Kansas City, Kans. Question—Resolved, that prohibition throughout the United States can best be secured by an amendment to the National Constitution prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, exportation or importation for sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes. Decision—Cooper College Affirmative 1, Kansas City University Negative 2.

Dual Debate (Women)—Friends University, Wichita, Kans.

Two on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Philippine Islands should be permanently retained by the United States. Decisions—At Sterling, 2 to 1 for Cooper Affirmative. At Wichita, 2 to 1 for Friends Affirmative.

Annual Debate (Freshmen)—Bethel College, Newton, Kans.

Two on teams. Date—March 16, 1915. Place—Sterling, Kans. Question—Resolved, that the United States should enact legislation embodying the principles of the German Industrial Insurance Law for the compensation of industrial accidents in this country. Decision—Bethel Negative 2 to 1.

Fairmount College. Wichita. Congregational. Clyde C. Harbison, Coach. Kenneth Cassidy, Manager 1915.

Triangular—With Friends University, Wichita, Kansas, and Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas. (See Friends University.)

Friends University. Wichita. Friends. Prof. W. J. Reagan, Coach. Manager 1915—Delbert Means. Manager 1916—N. Hall.

Triangular—Fairmount College, Wichita, Kans., and Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans. Two on teams. Date—April 30, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the federal government should enact legislation providing for compulsory arbitration of all labor disputes in the United States. (Constitutionality waived.) Decisions—At Friends, Wichita, Friends Affirmative 2, Fairmount Negative 1. At Winfield, Southwestern Affirmative 3, Friends

Negative o. At Fairmount, Wichita, Fairmount Affirmative 1, Southwestern Negative 2.

Annual Debate — Methodist University, Guthrie, Okla. Three on teams. Date — April 9, 1915. Place — Wichita. Question — Resolved, that the United States should not operate the railroads and mines in Alaska. Debate forfeited by Friends because they prepared to debate a wrong statement of the question. They had substituted "own and control" for "not operate" unwittingly.

Dual Debate. (See Cooper College, Kansas.)

Kansas State Agricultural College. Manhattan. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. John R. Macarthur, Coach. W. F. Taylor, Manager 1915.

Triangular — Colorado Agricultural College, Ft. Collins, and Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater. Two on teams. Date — March 19, 1915. Question — Resolved, that all able-bodied men in the United States should be required to perform one year's continuous military service before attaining the age of twenty-five. Decisions — At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 2, Oklahoma Negative 1. At Ft. Collins, Colorado Affirmative 2, Kansas Agricultural Negative 1. At Stillwater, Oklahoma Affirmative 3, Colorado Negative 0.

Triangular — Iowa State College, Ames, and Univ. of S. Dakota, Vermillion. Three on teams. Date — Nov. 13, 1914. Question — Resolved, that immigration into the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decisions — At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 0, S. Dakota Negative 3. At Ames, Iowa State Affirmative 0, K. S. A. C. Negative 3. At Vermillion, S. Dakota Affirmative 2, Iowa State 1.

Dual Debate (Women) — Washburn College, Topeka, Kans. Three on teams. Date — March 30, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should within a reasonable time grant independence to the Philippine Islands. Reasonable time defined as five years. Decisions — At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 0, Washburn Negative 3. At Topeka, Washburn Affirmative 3, K. S. A. C. Negative 0.

Dual Debate (Women) — Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina. Three on teams. Date — April 9, 1915. Question — Resolved, that immigration into the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decisions — At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 2, K. W. U. Negative 1. At Salina, K. W. U. Affirmative 2, K. S. A. C. Negative 1.

Dual Debate — Baker University, Baldwin, Kans. Three on teams. Date — April 23, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should within a reasonable time grant independence to the Philippine Islands. Decisions — At Manhattan, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 0, Baker Univ. Negative 3. At Baldwin, Baker Affirmative 3, K. S. A. C. Negative 0.

Annual Debate — Kansas State Normal, Emporia. Three on teams. Date — May 7, 1915. Place — Manhattan. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate the telegraph and telephone systems of the United States. Decision, K. S. A. C. Affirmative 1, Kans. Normal 0.

Kansas State Normal. Emporia. Non-sectarian. F. L. Gilson, Coach and Manager.

Dual Debate — Northwestern Normal, Alva, Okla. Two on teams. Date — March 5, 1915. Question — Resolved, that for economic and industrial reasons peaceful annexation of Mexico to the United States would be beneficial to both countries. Decisions — At Emporia, Kansas Normal 1, Northwestern Normal 0. At Alva, Northwestern Normal Affirmative 1, Kansas Normal Negative 0.

Annual Debate — College of Emporia, Emporia. Three on Teams. Date — March 31, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should own and operate the telegraph and telephone systems. Decision — Kansas Normal Affirmative 1, Emporia Negative 0.

Annual Debate. (See Kansas Agricultural College above.)

Kansas Wesleyan. Salina. Methodist. Coach, L. C. Huffman. Manager — J. B. Heckert.

Annual Debate — William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. Three

on teams. Date — April 21, 1915. Place — Salina, Kans. Question — Resolved, that a federal charter should be required for corporations doing an interstate business. Decision — Kansas Wesleyan Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — University of Denver, Colo. Two on teams. Date — April 19, 1915. Place — Denver, Colo. Question — Resolved, that a unicameral form of legislature should be adopted by the states of the United States. Decision — Kansas Wesleyan Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans. Two on teams. Date — May 7, 1915. Place — Ottawa. Question — Resolved, that unicameral form of legislature should be adopted by the states of the United States. Decision — Ottawa Aff. 3 to 0.

Dual Debate (Women). (See Kansas Agricultural College.)
McPherson College. McPherson. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Cooper College, Sterling, Kansas.)

Ottawa University. Ottawa. Baptist. Pi Kappa Delta. C. O. Hardy, Coach 1915. L. E. Ritchie, Coach 1916. Manager, Roy Taylor.

Triangular — Washburn College, Topeka, Kans., and Baker University, Baldwin, Kans. Three on teams. Date — April 9, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should grant independence to the Philippines within a reasonable length of time (Reasonable time to be interpreted as not more than five years). Decisions — At Ottawa, Ottawa Affirmative 1, Washburn Negative 2. At Baldwin, Baker Affirmative 1, Ottawa Negative 2. At Topeka, Washburn Affirmative vs. Baker Negative — no report.

Annual Debate — Kansas Wesleyan, Salina, Kans. (See Kansas Wesleyan above.)

Annual Debate (Women) — College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Place — Ottawa. Question — Resolved, that Congress should establish an educational test for immigrants, similar to that provided in the Dillingham Bill. Decision — Ottawa Negative 1 to 0.

Southwestern College. Winfield. Methodist. Pi Kappa

Delta. Albert J. McCulloch, Coach. John P. Mantla, Manager 1914-15. Howard White, Manager 1915-16.

Triangular — Friends Univ. and Fairmount College, both of Wichita, Kans. (See Friends University.)

Annual Debate — Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa. Three on teams. Date — April 9, 1915. Place — Winfield, Kansas. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decision — Southwestern College Negative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate — Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma. Two on teams. Date — Place — Enid, Okla. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decision — Southwestern Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans. Three on teams. Date — Place — Winfield, Kans. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decision — Southwestern College Affirmative — 2 to 1.

University of Kansas. Lawrence. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Phi Alpha Tau. Howard T. Hill, Coach. Manager 1915 — Harold F. Mattoon.

Triangular — with universities of Colorado and Oklahoma. Three on teams. Date — April 15, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the single tax on land should be substituted for all other forms of state and local taxation. Decisions — At Lawrence, Kansas Affirmative 3, Oklahoma Negative 0. At Boulder, Colo., Colorado Affirmative 1, Kansas Negative 2. At Norman, Okla., no report.

Annual Debate — Missouri University, Columbia. Three on teams. Date — April 21, 1915. Place — Columbia, Mo. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Missouri Negative 2 to 1.

Washburn College. Topeka. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. E. D. Schonberger, Coach. No report 1915.

Triangular — Baker and Ottawa Universities, Kansas. (See Ottawa.)

Dual — Kansas Agricultural College, see above.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky. Lexington. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular. Alabama and Vanderbilt. See Vanderbilt Univ., Tennessee.

LOUISIANA

Centenary College. Shreveport. No report 1915.

Annual Debate—Ouachita College, Arkansas. See under Arkansas.

Louisiana State University. Baton Rouge. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Prof. J. Q. Adams, Coach and Manager.

Triangular—Universities of Texas and Arkansas. Two on teams. Date—April 9, 1915.—Question, Resolved, that the several states should establish schedules of minimum wages for unskilled labor, constitutionality conceded. Decisions—At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Affirmative 2, Arkansas Negative 1. At Austin, Texas, Texas Affirmative 2, Louisiana Negative 1. At Fayetteville, Arkans., Arkansas Affirmative 2, Texas Negative 1.

Tulane University. New Orleans. Non-sectarian. Coaches, Prof. James Routh, Nicholas Callan, and Charles Dunbar. Manager 1915—Edmund Glenny, Jr.

Annual Debate—University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Two on teams. Date—April 24, 1915. Place—New Orleans. Question—Resolved, that Germany was justified in declaring war upon Russia, all discussion of events subsequent to the beginning of hostilities being waived. Decision—Tulane Affirmative 1, Pennsylvania Negative 2.

Annual Debate—Alabama Polytechnic, Auburn. Two on teams. Date—May 3, 1915. Place—Auburn, Ala. Question—Resolved, that Germany was justifiable in declaring war upon Russia, all discussion of events subsequent to the beginning of hostilities being waived. Decision—Tulane Negative 3 to 0.

MAINE

Bates College. Lewiston. Non-sectarian. S. R. Oldham, Coach. No report 1915.

Triangular — Clark College, Mass., and Tufts College, Mass.
(See Clark College.)

Bowdoin College. Brunswick. Non-sectarian. Wm. Hawley Davis, English Dep't., in charge. Manager 1915 — G. W. Bacon. Manager 1916 — H. M. Hescock.

Triangular — Hamilton College, New York, and Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. Three on teams. Date — March 25, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the naval strength of the United States should be materially increased. Decisions — At Brunswick, Hamilton Affirmative 1, Bowdoin Negative 2. At Middletown, Bowdoin Affirmative 0, Wesleyan Negative 3. At Clinton, Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Hamilton Negative 2.

Colby College. Waterville. Baptist. No report 1915.

Dual Debate. (See University of Maine.)

University of Maine. Orono. Non-sectarian. E. Keyes, Coach.

Dual Debate — Colby College, Waterville, Me. Three on teams. Date — April 21, 1915. Question — Resolved, that, in cities of 25,000 and over in the United States, a tax upon land alone should be substituted for the present real property tax, the substitution to be gradual and completed within ten years. Decisions — At Orono, Colby Negative 3 to 0. At Waterville, Colby Affirmative 2 to 1.

MARYLAND

Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore. Non-sectarian. Prof. John C. French, in charge. Manager 1915 — W. Brinton.

Triangular — Universities of Virginia and North Carolina. Two on teams. Date — April 24, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the policy of colonial expansion is desirable for a modern state. Decisions — At Baltimore, N. Carolina Affirmative 5, Virginia Negative 0. At Charlottesville, Va., Johns Hopkins Affirmative 5, N. Carolina Negative 0. At Chapel Hill, N. C., Virginia Affirmative 1, Johns Hopkins Negative 4.

Annual Debate — Univ. of Pennsylvania. Date — April 16, 1915. Place — Baltimore. Question — Resolved, that the

policy of colonial expansion is desirable for a modern state. Decision — Johns Hopkins 3 to 0.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston College. Chestnut Hill, P. O. Boston. Roman Catholic. Allen F. Duggin, S. J., Coach. Manager 1915 — John J. Walsh.

Annual Debate — Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. Three on teams. Date — May 9, 1915. Place — Washington, D. C. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should adopt a policy of building up a merchant marine by subscribing for fifty-one per cent. of the capital stock of a corporation to be engaged in the foreign trade. Decision — Georgetown Negative 5 to 0.

Clark College. Worcester. Non-sectarian. Prof. F. H. Hawkins, in charge. Manager 1915 — Theodore E. Shea. Triangular — Bates College, Lewiston, Me., and Tufts, Medford, Mass. Three on teams. Date — April 23, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all telegraph and telephone lines within the United States. Decisions — At Worcester, Clark Affirmative 2, Bates Negative 1. At Medford, Tufts Affirmative 3, Clark Negative 0. At Lewiston, Bates Affirmative vs. Tufts Negative, no report.

Harvard University. Cambridge. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Tau Kappa Alpha. A. P. Stone, Coach, 27 State St., Boston. R. J. White, Manager 1915. No report 1915.

Triangular — Yale and Princeton Universities. (See Yale, under Conn.)

Triangular — Yale and Princeton Freshmen. (See Yale under Conn.)

Tufts College. Medford. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular — Clark College, Worcester, Mass., and Bates College, Lewiston, Me. (See Clark College above.)

MICHIGAN

Albion College. Albion. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Annual Debate — Hillsdale College, Mich. (See Hillsdale.)

Alma College. Alma. Presbyterian. No report 1915.

Triangular — Hope and Olivet Colleges, Michigan. See below.

Ferris Institute. No report 1915.

Triangular — See Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti, Mich.

Hillsdale College. Hillsdale. Non-sectarian. Gordon L. Cave, Coach and Manager.

Triangular — Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich., and Hope College, Holland, Mich. Three on teams. Date — March 19, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should subsidize its merchant marine. Decisions — At Hillsdale, Hillsdale Affirmative 3, Hope Negative 0. At Kalamazoo, Kalamazoo Affirmative 2, Hillsdale Negative 1. At Holland, Hope Affirmative 3, Kalamazoo Negative 0.

Annual Debate — Albion College, Albion, Mich. Three on teams. Date — May 5, 1915. Place — Albion. Question — Resolved, that the labor unions should be exempted from the operations of the federal anti-trust laws. Decision — Albion College Negative 3 to 0.

Hope College. Holland. Reform of America. Prof. J. B. Nykerk, in charge. Manager 1915 — T. Elferdink.

Triangular — Hillsdale and Kalamazoo Colleges, Michigan. (See Hillsdale immediately above.)

Triangular — Alma College, Alma, Michigan and Olivet College, Olivet, Mich. Three on teams. Date — March 19, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should subsidize its merchant marine. Decisions — At Holland, Hope Affirmative 2, Olivet Negative 1. At Alma, Alma Affirmative 1, Hope Negative 2. At Olivet, Olivet Affirmative 3, Alma Negative 0.

Kalamazoo College. Kalamazoo. Baptist. E. J. MacEwan, Eng. Dept., in charge. President, Sherwood Literary Society manages.

Triangular Debate — Hillsdale College and Hope College, Michigan. (See Hillsdale above.)

Michigan State Normal. Ypsilanti. Non-sectarian. F. B.

McKay, Prof. of Public Speaking, in charge. Harold A. Hendershot, Manager 1915.

Triangular—Central State Normal School and Ferris Institute, Mich. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 26, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should subsidize its merchant marine. Decisions—At Ypsilanti, Michigan State Normal Affirmative 2, Central Normal Negative 1. At Ferris Institute, Institute Affirmative 2, Michigan State Normal Negative 1. At Central Normal, Central Normal Affirmative 2, Ferris Negative 1.

Michigan Central State Normal. No report. (See Michigan Normal above.)

Olivet College. Olivet. Non-sectarian. Dr. T. W. Nadal, in charge. Manager 1915—Dwight C. Long. Manager 1916—Walter Hoist.

Triangular—Alma and Hope Colleges, Michigan. (See Hope College above.)

University of Michigan. Ann Arbor. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Thos. C. Trueblood, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge.

Triangular—Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., and Chicago University, Chicago, Ill. Three on teams. Date—Jan. 16, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine, as developed and applied by the United States, should be abandoned as a part of our foreign policy. Decisions—At Ann Arbor, Michigan Affirmative 2, Chicago Negative 1. At Evanston, Northwestern Affirmative 3, Michigan Negative 0. At Chicago—no report.

Triangular—Universities of Illinois and Wisconsin. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1915. Question—Resolved, that in anti-trust legislation labor unions should be exempt from construction as combinations in restraint of trade. Decisions—At Ann Arbor, Michigan Affirmative 1, Illinois 2. At Madison, Wisconsin 0, Michigan 3. At Urbana—no report.

MINNESOTA

Carleton College. Northfield. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. I. M. Cochran, Coach and Manager.

Pentangular — with Minnesota Colleges. Carleton met Gustavus Adolphus and Hamline University. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decisions — At Northfield, Carleton Affirmative 3, Gustavus Adolphus 0. At St. Paul, Hamline Affirmative 0, Carleton Negative 3.

Gustavus Adolphus. St. Peter. Lutheran. L. Malenberg, Coach and Manager.

Pentangular — with Minnesota colleges. Gustavus Adolphus met Macalester and Carleton. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decisions — At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus Affirmative 2, Macalester Negative 1. At Northfield, Carleton Affirmative 3, Gustavus Adolphus 0.

Hamline University. St. Paul. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Pentangular with Minnesota Colleges. (See Carleton and St. Olaf Colleges.)

Macalester College. St. Paul. Presbyterian. Prof. Glenn Clark, Coach. Manager 1915 — G. R. Collins. Manager 1916 — J. I. Roth.

Pentangular with Minnesota Colleges. Macalester met Gustavus Adolphus and St. Olaf. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decisions — At St. Paul, Affirmative, Macalester 2, Negative, St. Olaf 1. At St. Peter, Gustavus Adolphus 2, Macalester 1.

Annual Debate — Grinnell College, Iowa. Three on teams. Date — Feb. 26, 1915. Place — St. Paul. Question — Resolved, that a single tax on land values would be a desirable form of state and local taxation. Decision — Macalester Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — South Dakota University. Vermillion. Three on teams. Date — March 5, 1915. Place — Vermillion, S. Dak. Question — Resolved, that a single tax on land values would be a desirable form of state and

local taxation. Decision—Macalester Affirmative 3 to 0. Triangular—Fargo College, N. Dak., and Huron College, S. Dakota. Three on teams. Date—March 30, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all interstate railways. At St. Paul, Huron Affirmative 0, Macalester Negative 3. At Fargo, Macalester Affirmative 1, Fargo Negative 2. At Huron, Fargo Affirmative 0, Huron Negative 3.

St. Olaf College. Northfield. Lutheran. No report 1915. Pentangular—with Minnesota colleges. St. Olaf met Hamline University and Macalester College. Three on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decisions—At Northfield, St. Olaf Affirmative 2, Hamline Negative 1. At St. Paul, Macales-ter Affirmative 2, St. Olaf 1.

University of Minnesota. Minneapolis. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Haldor B. Gilason, Coach and Manager.

Pentangular—State Universities of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Wisconsin. Minnesota met Iowa and Illinois. Three on teams. Date—Dec. 12, 1914. Question—Resolved, that the several states of the union should establish a schedule of minimum wages for unskilled labor. Decisions—At Minneapolis, Minnesota Affirmative 3, Iowa Negative 0. At Urbana, Illinois Affirmative 0, Minne-sota Negative 3.

MISSOURI

Central College. Fayette. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Annual Debate—See Hendrix College, Arkansas.

Drury College. Springfield. Non-sectarian. L. E. Meader, Coach. S. D. Campbell, Manager 1915—Frank H. Hedges, Manager 1916.

Annual Debate—Park College, Mo. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Place—Springfield, Mo. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage legislation should be ap-

plied to the field of sweated industries. Decision — Park College Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. Three on teams. Date — May 6, 1915. Place — Springfield. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied by the United States should be abandoned as a part of our foreign policy. Decision — Drury College Negative 3 to 0.

Park College. Parkville. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (Drury College, see above.)

William Jewell College. Liberty. Baptist. Dr. Elmer C. Griffith, Coach. W. J. Chase, Manager 1915. Ray Erving, Manager 1916.

Annual Debate — Colorado College, Colorado Springs. Three on teams. Date — March 2, 1915. Place — Liberty, Mo. Question — Resolved, that the Legislative Commission System of state government is preferable to the present system. Decision — Colorado College Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — Kansas Wesleyan, Salina, Kans. Three on teams. Date — April 30, 1915. Place — Salina, Kans. Question — Resolved, that all corporations engaged in interstate commerce be required to take out a federal charter on such terms as Congress shall present. Constitutionality granted. Decision — Kansas Wesleyan Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — Drury College, Springfield, Mo. (See Drury above.)

MONTANA

Montana State College. Bozeman. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular — Montana University, and Gonzaga University, Washington. (See Montana University below.)

University of Montana. Missoula. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. G. R. Coffman, Coach. Manager 1915 — Payne Templeton. Manager 1916 — Will G. Long.

Triangular — Montana State College, Bozeman, and Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. Two on teams. Date — Feb. 19, 1915. Question — Resolved, that an alliance with the A. B. C. countries should be substituted

for the Monroe Doctrine for protection of American continents. Decisions—At Missoula, Montana Affirmative 1, Gonzaga Negative 2. At Bozeman, Montana State Affirmative 0, Montana Univ. Negative 3. At Spokane, Gonzaga Affirmative 2, Montana State Negative 1.

Annual Debate—University of N. Dakota, Grand Forks. Two on teams. Date—March 20, 1915. Place—Grand Forks, N. Dak. Question—Resolved, that an alliance with the A. B. C. countries should be substituted for the Monroe Doctrine for protecting American continents. Decision—Montana Negative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate—University of Utah, Salt Lake City. Three on teams. Date—March 20, 1915. Place—Missoula, Mont. Question—Resolved, that regulation of monopoly is the best way of dealing with the trust problem. Decision—Montana Affirmative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate—University of Oregon, Eugene. Three on teams. Date—April 5, 1915. Place—. Question—Resolved, that all railroads doing an interstate business should be owned and operated by the United States government. Decision—Oregon 2 to 1.

NEBRASKA

Bellevue College. Bellevue. Non-sectarian. Prof. W. A. Peters, Coach. Manager—Anne M. Johnson. Manager 1916—W. E. Webb.

Triangular—Cotner College, Bethany, Nebr., and Doane College, Crete, Nebr. Three on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the railroads in the United States should be owned and operated by the federal government. Decisions—At Bellevue, Bellevue Affirmative 0, Cotner Negative 3. At Crete, Doane Affirmative, Bellevue Negative. Defaulted by Bellevue. At Bethany, Cotner Affirmative 2, Doane Negative 1.

Cotner College. Bethany. Christian. No coach 1913-15. C. G. Miles, Coach 1916. Peter Cope, Manager 1915. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Bellevue College, Nebraska.)

Doane College. Crete. Congregational. Prof. J. E. Taylor,

Coach. R. B. Noyce, Manager 1915. H. C. Hasford,
Manager 1916.

Triangular. (See Bellevue College, Nebr., above.)

Annual Debate—Nebraska Wesleyan, University Place, Nebr. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1915. Place—University Place. Question—Resolved, that the railroads of the United States should be owned and operated by the federal government. Decision—Wesleyan Negative 2 to 1.

Grand Island College. Grand Island. Baptist. Martha Firth, Coach. Herman Benjamin, Manager 1915. Frank Wieland, Manager 1916.

Annual Debate—Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr. Three on teams. Date—May 7, 1915. Place—Hastings. Nebr. Three on teams. Date—May 7, 1915. Place—Hastings. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the policy of the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Grand Island Negative 2 to 1.

Hastings College. Hastings. Presbyterian. No coach. R. B. Crone, in charge.

Annual Debate—Grand Island College, Nebr. (See above.)

Nebraska Wesleyan University. University Place, Nebr. Methodist. Pi Kappa Delta. Prof. E. H. Wells, Coach. Winthrop Lane, Manager 1915. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Doane College, Nebr., above.)

University of Nebraska. Lincoln. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Phi Alpha Tau. M. M. Fogg, Prof. of Rhetoric, in charge. No report 1915.

Pentangular with state universities of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota. No report 1915.

University of Nevada. Reno. Non-sectarian. A. E. Turner, Coach. Manager 1915—J. A. Cazier. Manager 1916—John W. Heard.

Annual Debate—Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Two on teams. Date—Feb. 26, 1915. Place—Provo, Utah. Question—Resolved, that a tax on land values should be substituted for the general property tax for city purposes in American cities of over ten thousand population. Decision—Brigham Young Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — College of the Pacific, San José, Calif. Two on teams. Date — April 6, 1915. Place — Reno, Nev. Question — Resolved, that a tax on land values should be substituted for the general property tax for city purposes in American cities of over ten thousand population. Decision — College of Pacific Negative 3 to 0.

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University. Princeton. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. H. F. Covington, Professor of Public Speaking, in charge. No report 1915.

Triangular — Harvard and Yale. (See Yale Univ., Conn.)

Triangular — Harvard and Yale freshmen. (See Yale Univ., Conn.)

Rutgers College. New Brunswick. Non-sectarian. Prof. Livingston Barbour, in charge. No report 1915.

Triangular — New York University, and Trinity College, Conn. (See New York University.)

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Agricultural College. State College. Non-sectarian. Sherman B. Neff, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Three on teams. Date — March 6, 1915. Place — State College. Question — Resolved, that municipalities of the United States should own and operate plants for supplying light, water and transportation. Decision — Affirmative, Univ. of N. Mexico, 2 to 1.

University of New Mexico. Albuquerque. Non-sectarian. C. E. Bonnet, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. (See above, New Mexico Agricultural College.)

Annual Debate — Las Vegas Normal, Las Vegas. Three on team. Date — Place — Question — Resolved, that municipalities of the United States should own and operate plants for supplying light, water and transportation. Decision — Forfeited to New Mexico by Las Vegas.

NEW YORK

Colgate University. Hamilton. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. E. W. Smith, Professor of Public Speaking, in charge. Manager 1915—Bernard C. Clausen. Manager 1916—Oliver A. Wepner.

Triangular—University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., and Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio. Three on teams. Date Feb. 12, 1915, Feb. 20, 1915. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decisions—Colgate Affirmative 2, Ohio Wesleyan Negative 1, at Hamilton. At Rochester, Rochester Affirmative 2, Colgate Negative 1. At Rochester, Ohio Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Rochester Negative 2.

Dual—Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 9, 1915. Place—Delaware, O. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decision—Ohio Wesleyan Affirmative 2, Colgate Negative 1. (For other debate see triangular above.)

Annual Debate—St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. Three on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Place—Hamilton. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decision—Colgate Affirmative 3, St. Lawrence Negative 0.

Columbia University. New York. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Triangular—Cornell University and Pennsylvania University. (See Cornell.)

Cornell University. Ithaca. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. J. A. Winans, Prof. of Public Speaking, in charge. Manager 1915—E. D. Rogers.

Triangular—Columbia University and Pennsylvania. Three on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Question—Resolved,

that the United States should take immediate steps to increase its army and navy. Decisions—At Ithaca, Cornell Affirmative 1, Pennsylvania Negative 2. At New York City, Columbia Affirmative 1, Negative Cornell 2. At Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Affirmative 0, Columbia Negative 3.

Annual Debate. (See Syracuse University, N. Y.)

Hamilton College. Clinton. Non-sectarian. Prof. Calvin L. Lewis, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge.

Triangular—Bowdoin College, Maine, and Wesleyan College, Middletown, Conn. Three on teams. Date—March 25, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States naval strength should be materially increased. Decisions—At Clinton, Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Hamilton Negative 2. At Middletown, Bowdoin Affirmative 0, Wesleyan Negative 3. At Brunswick, Hamilton Affirmative 1, Bowdoin Negative 2.

New York University. New York City. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Charles A. Tonsor, Jr., Coach. Manager 1915-16—Leon Sternberger.

Triangular—Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., and Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. Jersey. Three on teams. Date—May 6, 1915. Place—New York City. Question—Resolved, that the United States should adopt a program of increased armament. Decisions—At New York, New York University Affirmative 2, Rutgers Negative 1. At Hartford, Trinity Affirmative 1, New York Univ. Negative 2. At New Brunswick, Rutgers Affirmative vs. Trinity Negative, no report.

Syracuse University. Syracuse. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. S. L. Kennedy, Coach and Manager.

Dual Debate—Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Three on teams. Date—Dec. 14, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the federal government should prohibit throughout the country the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages. Decisions—At New Haven, Syracuse Affirmative 0, Yale Negative 3. At Syracuse, Yale Affirmative (Freshmen) 0, Syracuse Negative 3.

Annual Debate—Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. Three on

teams. Date—April 22, 1915. Place—Syracuse. Question—Resolved, that the United States should immediately increase its armament. Decision—Syracuse Negative 2 to 1.

University of Rochester. Rochester. Non-sectarian. Prof. John R. Slater, in charge. Manager 1915—Russell A. Lipscomb. Manager 1916—Clarence T. Leighton, 9 Kendrich Hall.

Triangular—Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., and Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, O. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 12, 13, 20, 1915. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decisions—At Rochester, Ohio Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Rochester Negative 2. At Rochester, Rochester Affirmative 1, Colgate Negative 2. At Hamilton, Colgate Affirmative 2, Ohio Wesleyan Negative 1.

Annual Debate—Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 26, 1915. Place—Meadville, Pa. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decision—Rochester Affirmative 3 to 0.

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College. Davidson. Presbyterian. No Coach. Manager 1915—C. H. Rowan. Manager 1916—J. G. Patton.

Annual Debate—Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C. Two on teams. Date—April 5, 1915. Place Rock Hill, S. C., at Winthrop College. Question—Resolved, that immigration into the United States should be further restricted by the imposition of a literacy test. Decision—Davidson Affirmative 4 to 1.

Annual Debate—Emory College, Oxford, Ga. Two on teams. Date—April 12, 1915. Place—Decatur, Ga., at Agnes Scott College. Question—Resolved, that an alliance of all American countries should take the place of

the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Davidson Affirmative 2 to 1.

North Carolina Agricultural College. W. Raleigh. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See University of Georgia.)

Trinity College. Durham. Methodist Episcopal South. Holland Holton, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va. Three on teams. Date — March 9, 1915. Place — Lexington, Va. Question — Resolved, that the nominating convention is preferable to the direct primary as a means of selecting candidates for offices filled by popular election. Decision — Washington and Lee Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. Three on teams. Date — March 12, 1915. Place — Swarthmore, Pa. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned. Decision — Swarthmore Affirmative 3 to 0.

University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. No coach. Debate Union manages.

Triangular — Johns Hopkins University and University of Virginia. Two on teams. Date — April 24, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the policy of colonial expansion is desirable for a modern state. Decisions — At Chapel Hill, Virginia Affirmative 1, Johns Hopkins Negative 4. At Baltimore, N. Carolina Affirmative 5, Virginia Negative 0. At Charlottesville, Va., Johns Hopkins Affirmative 5, N. Carolina Negative 0.

Wake Forest College. Wake Forest. Baptist. Dr. G. W. Paschal, in charge.

Dual Debate — Richmond College, Richmond, Va. Three on teams. Date — May 1, 1915. Question — Resolved, that all industrial disputes should be settled by compulsory arbitration. Decisions — At Richmond, Richmond Affirmative 0, Wake Forest Negative 3. At Wake Forest, Wake Forest Affirmative 3, Richmond Negative 0.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo College. Fargo. Non-sectarian. Prof. A. E. Fich, Coach and Manager.

Triangular—Macalester College, Minnesota, and Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron College.)

North Dakota Agricultural College. Fargo. Non-sectarian. Alfred G. Arvold, Coach and Manager.

Dual Debate—South Dakota Agricultural College, Brookings. Two on teams. Date—April 3, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the several states should adopt laws embodying the principles of the minimum wage. Decisions—At Fargo, N. Dak. Affirmative 3, S. Dak. Negative 0. At Brookings, S. Dak. Affirmative 2, N. Dak. Negative 1.

Annual Debate—University of Southern California Law School. Two on teams. Date—March 12, 1915. Place—Fargo, S. Dak. Question—Resolved, that the initiative and referendum should be made a part of the legislative system of state governments. Decision—North Dakota Affirmative 2 to 1.

University of North Dakota. Grand Forks. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. John Adams Taylor, in charge. Franklin Page, Manager 1915.

Annual Debate—University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 26, 1915. Place—Winnipeg. Question—Resolved, that the United States should continue the Monroe Doctrine as a part of its permanent policy. Decision—N. Dakota Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—University of Montana, Missoula. Two on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Place—Grand Forks, N. Dak. Question—Resolved, that an alliance with the A. B. C. republics for the protection of the American continent from foreign aggression would be preferable to a continuation of the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Univ. of Montana Negative 3 to 0.

OHIO

Baldwin-Wallace College. Berea. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Triangular — With Hiram College and Heidelberg University.
(See Heidelberg Univ., Ohio.)

Cincinnati, University of. Cincinnati. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Quadrangular. (See Denison University, Ohio.)

Detroit, University of. Detroit. Catholic. No report 1915.

Dual Debate. (See Heidelberg University, Ohio.)

Denison University. Granville. Baptist. Bunyan Spencer, Coach. Manager 1915 — R. A. Cheadle.

Quadrangular — Univ. of Cincinnati, Ohio University, Athens, Miami University, Oxford. Denison met Cincinnati and Ohio University. Three on teams. Date — March 26, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should increase its naval expenditure to the amount recommended by the naval advisory board. Decisions — at Granville, Denison Affirmative 2, Cincinnati Negative 1. At Athens, Ohio Univ. Affirmative 1, Denison Negative 2. At Granville, April 9, 1915, Denison Affirmative 0, Ohio Negative 3.

Heidelberg University. Tiffin. Reform in U. S. Prof. R. A. Swink, in charge. Manager 1915 — C. L. Menser. Manager 1916 — C. A. Warner.

Triangular — Hiram College, Hiram, O., and Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, O. Three on teams. Date — March 5, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions — At Tiffin, Heidelberg Affirmative 2, Baldwin-Wallace Negative 1. At Hiram, Hiram Affirmative 2, Heidelberg Negative 1. At Berea, no report.

Dual Debate — University of Detroit, Mich. Three on teams. Date — —. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions — At Tiffin, Detroit Affirmative 1, Heidelberg Univ. Negative 2. At Detroit, Heidelberg Affirmative 3, Detroit Negative 0.

Hiram College. Hiram. Non-sectarian. Marshall Pancoast, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Heidelberg University, Ohio, above.)

Marietta College. Marietta. Non-sectarian. A. G. Beach, Coach and Manager.

Triangular — Bethany College, W. Va., and W. Va. Wesleyan, Buckhannon. Two on teams. Date — May 14, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should materially increase its army and navy. Decisions — At Marietta, W. Va., Wesleyan Affirmative 1, Marietta Negative 2. At Bethany, Marietta Affirmative 1, Bethany Negative 2. At Buckhannon, no report.

Miami University. Oxford. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Arthur L. Gates, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. No report 1915.

Quadrangular. (See Denison University above.)

Mt. Union. Alliance. Methodist. Herbert D. Simpson, in charge. No report 1915.

Muskingum. New Concord. United Presbyterian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Wilbur C. Dennis, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. J. C. Lorimer, Manager 1915. No report 1915.

Oberlin College. Oberlin. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho (?). No report 1915.

Triangular — Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, and Western Reserve, Cleveland, O. (See Ohio Wesleyan.)

Ohio State University. Columbus. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. V. A. Ketcham, Dept. of English, in charge.

Dual Debate — Indiana University, Bloomington. Three on teams. Date — March 12, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate the telephone and telegraph systems in the United States. Decisions — At Columbus, Ohio State Affirmative 3, Indiana Negative 0. At Bloomington, Ind., Indiana Affirmative 0, Ohio State Negative 3.

Ohio University. Athens. Non-sectarian. Prof. H. R. Pierce, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Quadrangular. (See Denison University above.)

Ohio Wesleyan University. Delaware. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. Robert I. Fulton, Dept. of Public Speaking, in charge. Prof. Charles N. Newcomb, assistant, in charge.

Triangular — Oberlin College, Oberlin, O., and Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. Three on teams. Date — Jan. 15, Jan. 22, 1915. Question — Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decisions — At Delaware, Western Reserve Affirmative vs. Ohio Wesleyan. No decision, no judges. At Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan Affirmative vs. Oberlin Negative. No decision. At Cleveland, Oberlin Affirmative vs. Western Reserve Negative. No decision.

Triangular — Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., and University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (See Colgate under New York.)

Additional Debate. (See Colgate University, New York.)

Western Reserve University. Cleveland. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. H. S. Woodward, Coach. Manager 1915 — Burt MacBride. Manager 1916 — Ross McD. Coen, 11431 Euclid Ave.

Triangular — Ohio Wesleyan and Oberlin. (See Ohio Wesleyan above.)

Wilberforce University. Wilberforce. African Methodist Episcopal. Prof. L. F. Palmer, Coach. Manager 1915 — A. L. Simpson. Manager 1916 — H. W. Sheppard.

Annual Debate — Lincoln University, Chester, Pa. Three on teams. Date — April 30, 1915. Place — Wilberforce. Question — Resolved, that immigration into the United States should be further restricted by an illiteracy test. Decision — Wilberforce Negative 2 to 1.

Wooster, University of. Wooster. Presbyterian. Delbert G. Lean, Professor of Public Speaking, in charge. No report 1915.

Triangular — Allegheny College and University of Pittsburgh. (See Allegheny College.)

OKLAHOMA

Northwest Normal. Alva. Non-sectarian. No report 1915. Dual Debate. (See Kansas State Normal.)

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. Stillwater.
Non-sectarian. Isadore Samuels, Coach and Manager.

Triangular — Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan, and Colorado Agricultural College, Ft. Collins. Two on teams. Date — March 19, 1915. Question — Resolved, that all able-bodied men in the United States should perform one year's continuous military service before attaining the age of twenty-five. Decisions — At Stillwater, Oklahoma Affirmative 3, Colorado Negative 0. At Manhattan, Kans., Kansas Affirmative 2, Oklahoma Negative 1. At Ft. Collins, Colorado Affirmative 2, Kansas Negative 1.

Annual Debate — Oklahoma Methodist University, Guthrie. Three on teams. Date — April 23, 1915. Place — Guthrie. Question — Resolved, that the mines and railroads in Alaska should not be operated by the United States government. Decision — Not decided. (See Oklahoma Methodist Univ.)

Oklahoma Methodist University. Guthrie. Methodist. H. G. McAllister, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater. Three on teams. Date — April 20, 1915. Place — Guthrie. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should not operate the mines and railroads of Alaska. Decision — Methodist University Affirmative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate — Friends University, Wichita, Kans. Three on teams. Date — April 23, 1915. Place — Wichita. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should not operate the mines and railroads of Alaska. Decision — Friends University forfeited to Methodist Univ.

Phillips University. Enid. C. C. Taylor, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — Kingfisher College, Kingfisher, Okla. Three on teams. Date — Feb. 26, 1915. Place — Enid. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decision — Phillips Negative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate — Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.

Two on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Place—Enid. Question—Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all interstate railroads. Decision—Southwestern Negative 2 to 1.

University of Oklahoma. Norman. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Triangular—Universities of Kansas and Colorado. (See University of Kansas.)

OREGON

Oregon Agricultural College. Corvallis. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Willamette University, Oregon.)

University of Oregon. Eugene. Non-sectarian. Robert W. Prescott, Coach. No report 1915.

Triangular—Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif., and Washington University, Seattle. (See Stanford University, Calif.)

Annual Debate. (See University of Montana.)

Willamette University. Salem. Methodist Episcopal. Prof. M. L. Senn, Coach. Manager 1915—Paul Irvine. Manager 1916—John L. Gray.

Annual Debate—Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis. Three on teams. Date—May 14, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States government should own and operate all railways in Continental United States except municipal street railways. Constitutionality conceded. Decision—Oregon Agricultural College Negative 2 to 1.

PENNSYLVANIA

Allegheny College. Meadville. Methodist Episcopal. Delta Sigma Rho. Stanley S. Swartly, Dept. of English, in charge.

Triangular—University of Pittsburgh, Pa., and University of Wooster, Ohio. Three on teams. Date—March 12, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should initiate a policy of increasing governmental responsibility for the natives of the Philippines to culminate in inde-

pendence about 1925. (By independence is meant the degree of natural freedom which the United States allowed Cuba.) Decisions—At Meadville, Pa., Allegheny Affirmative 1, Wooster Negative 2. At Pittsburgh, Univ. of Pittsburgh Affirmative 0, Allegheny Negative 3. At Wooster, O., Univ. of Wooster Affirmative 3, Pittsburgh Negative 0.

Annual Debate—University of Rochester, N. Y. Three on teams. Date—Feb. 26, 1915. Place—Meadville, Pa. Question—Resolved, that in the United States a socialistic control of the means of production and exchange would secure a more equitable distribution of wealth. Decision—Rochester Affirmative 3 to 0.

Dickinson College. Carlisle. Non-sectarian. No coach. Prof. W. W. Landis, Prof. M. G. Filler, in charge.

Quadrangular—Franklin and Marshall, State College and Swarthmore College. Three on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned. Decisions—At Carlisle, Swarthmore Affirmative 0, Dickinson Negative 3. At Swarthmore, Dickinson Affirmative 1, Swarthmore Negative 2.

Franklin and Marshall College. Lancaster. Reform in U. S. Prof. A. V. Heister in charge. No report 1915.

Quadrangular—Dickinson, State College, Swarthmore College. Franklin and Marshall met State College in dual debate. No report.

Geneva College. Beaver Falls. Ref. Presbyterian. H. H. Wylie, Coach. Leon A. Hamilton, Manager 1915. B. Allan Ludgate, Manager 1916.

Triangular—University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, and Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. Three on teams. Date—March 23, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned. Decisions—At Beaver Falls, Pittsburgh Affirmative 0, Geneva Negative 3. At New Wilmington, Westminster Affirmative 1, Geneva Negative 2. At Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Affirmative 2, Westminster Negative 1.

Juniata College. Huntingdon. Baptist. No report 1915. Annual Debate. (See Swarthmore College, Pa.)

Pennsylvania State College. State College. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho (?). J. H. Frizzell, Wm. Lewis Roberts, English Dept., Coaches. No report 1915.

Quadrangular—Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, Swarthmore. State College met Franklin and Marshall in dual meet. No report.

Triangular—University of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Washington and Jefferson. (See Washington and Jefferson, Pa.)

Annual Debate. (See Westminster College, Pa.)

Swarthmore College. Swarthmore. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Philip M. Hicks, Coach. Hugh F. Denworth, Manager 1915.

Quadrangular—Dickinson, Franklin and Marshall, State College. Swarthmore met Dickinson in dual debate. (See Dickinson above.)

Annual Debate—Trinity College, Durham, N. Carolina. Three on teams. Date—March 14, 1915. Place—Swarthmore. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Swarthmore Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa. Three on teams. Date—April 30, 1915. Place—. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Juniata Negative.

University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Prof. F. A. Child, in charge. Manager 1915—H. R. Sullivan.

Triangular—Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., and Columbia University, New York City. Three on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Question—Resolved, that in view of the present situation, the United States should take immediate steps to increase its army and navy. Decisions—At Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Affirmative 0, Columbia Negative 3. At Ithaca, Cornell Affirmative 1, Pennsylvania Negative 2. At New York City, Columbia Affirmative 1, Cornell Negative 2.

Annual Debate—Tulane University, New Orleans, La. Two on teams. Date—April 24, 1915. Place—New Orleans. Question—Resolved, that Germany was justified in de-

claring war on Russia. Decision — Pennsylvania Negative 2 to 1.

University of Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh. Non-sectarian. F. H. Lane, Coach Manager 1916 — F. W. Glaser.

Triangular — Allegheny College, Meadville, and University of Wooster, Ohio. (See Allegheny College, Pa., above.)

Triangular — Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., and Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. (See Geneva College, Pa. Not given as triangular by Westminster.)

Triangular — State College, Pa., and Washington and Jefferson, Pa. (See Washington and Jefferson below.)

Washington and Jefferson. Washington. Non-sectarian. Prof. Wilbur Jones Kay, in charge.

Triangular — University of Pittsburgh, and State College. Three on teams. Date — April 12, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decisions — At Washington, Washington and Jefferson Affirmative 2, Univ. of Pittsburgh 1. At State College, State College Affirmative 3, Washington and Jefferson Negative 0. At Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Affirmative 0, State College Negative 3.

Annual Debate — Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. Three on teams. Date — April 20, 1915. Place — New Wilmington, Pa. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Washington and Jefferson Affirmative 3 to 0.

Westminster College. New Wilmington, Pa. United Presbyterian. Elbert R. Moses, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. Three on teams. Date — March 25, 1915. Place — New Wilmington. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Geneva Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — University of Pittsburgh. Three on teams. Date — April 16, 1915. Place — Pittsburgh. Question — Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision — Pittsburgh Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — State College. Three on teams. Date —

March 26, 1915. Place—State College, Pa. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—State College Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—Washington and Jefferson. Washington, Pa. Three on teams. Date—April 17, 1915. Place—New Wilmington. Question—Resolved, that the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine. Decision—Washington and Jefferson Affirmative 2 to 1.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson Agricultural College. Clemson College. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Davidson College, N. Carolina.)

Triangular—College of Charleston, and Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C. (See College of Charleston, S. C.)

College of Charleston. Charleston. Non-sectarian. Prof. L. M. Harris, Coach. Manager 1915—C. W. Crouch. Manager 1916—G. L. B. Rivers.

Triangular—Clemson Agricultural College, and Wofford College, S. C. Two on teams. Date—April 17, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the central government of Great Britain is more truly democratic than the federal government of the United States. Decisions—At Charleston, Charleston Affirmative 3, Clemson Negative 0. At Spartanburg, Wofford Affirmative 1, Charleston Negative 2. At Clemson, Clemson Affirmative 1, Wofford Negative 2.

Furman University. Greenville. Baptist.

Annual Debate—Emory College, Oxford, Ga. Two on teams. Date—April 24, 1915. Place—Oxford, Ga. Question—Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied should be discontinued by the United States as part of our foreign policy. Decision—Emory College Affirmative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—Mercer University, Macon, Ga. Two on teams. Date—May 15, 1915. Place—Macon, Ga. Question—Resolved, that the several states should establish a schedule of minimum wages for unskilled la-

bor. Decision — Furman University Affirmative 3 to 0. Annual Debate — Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C. Two on teams. Date — May 1, 1915. Place — Greenville, S. C. Question — Resolved, that the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied should be discontinued by the United States as a part of our foreign policy. Decision — Wofford Negative 4 to 1.

University of S. Carolina. Columbia. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Triangular — University of Georgia, Athens, and University of Tennessee, Knoxville. (See under Georgia.)

Wofford College. Spartanburg. Methodist Episcopal South. No report 1915.

Triangular — College of Charleston and Clemson Agricultural College. (See College of Charleston, S. C., above.)

Annual Debate — Furman University, Greenville, S. C. (See Furman above.)

SOUTH DAKOTA

Dakota Wesleyan University. Mitchell. Methodist Episcopal. Pi Kappa Delta. Elmer Harrison Wilds, Coach and Manager.

Triangular — Huron College, S. Dak., and Yankton College, S. Dak. Three on teams. Date — March 5, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt laws embodying the principles of the minimum wage. Decisions — At Mitchell, Huron College Affirmative 0, Dakota Wesleyan Negative 3. At Yankton, Dakota Wesleyan Affirmative 2, Yankton Negative 1. At Huron, Yankton Affirmative 2, Huron Negative 1.

Huron College. Huron. Presbyterian. Everett Lee Hunt, Coach. C. J. Boe, Manager 1915-16.

Triangular — Dakota Wesleyan and Yankton College, S. Dak. (See Dakota Wesleyan above.)

Triangular — Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., and Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak. Three on teams. Date — March 30, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the federal government should own and operate all railways doing an interstate business. Decision — At Huron, Fargo Af-

firmative 0, Huron Negative 3. At St. Paul, Huron Affirmative 0, Macalester Negative 3. At Fargo, Macalester Affirmative 1, Fargo Negative 2.

Dual Debate—S. Dak. Agricultural College, Brookings. Three on teams. Date—April 12, 1915. Question—Resolved, that laws embodying the principle of the minimum wage should be adopted by the several states. Decisions—At Huron, Huron Affirmative 3, Dakota Agricultural 0. At Brookings, S. Dakota Agricultural 2, Huron Negative 1.

Annual Debate—Northern Normal, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1915. Place—Huron. Question—Resolved, that laws embodying the principle of the minimum wage should be adopted by the several states. Decision—Huron Negative 3 to 0.

South Dakota Agricultural College. Brookings. Non-sectarian. H. W. Ewing, Coach. No report 1915.

Dual Debate—Huron College, S. Dak. (See Huron.)

Dual Debate—North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. D. (See under N. Dak.)

South Dakota Northern Normal. Aberdeen. Non-sectarian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate—Huron College, Huron, S. Dak. (See above.)

University of South Dakota. Vermillion. Non-sectarian. Clarence E. Lyon, Coach and Manager.

Triangular—Iowa State College, Ames, and Kansas Agricultural College, Manhattan. Three on teams. Date—Nov. 13, 1914. Question—Resolved, that immigration to the United States should be further restricted by a literacy test. Decisions—At Vermillion, S. Dakota Affirmative 2, Iowa Negative 1. At Manhattan, Kansas State Affirmative 0, S. Dakota Negative 3. At Ames, Iowa State Affirmative 0, Kansas State Negative 3.

Triangular—Grinnell College, Iowa, and Drake University, Iowa. Three on teams. Date—March 12, 1915. Question—Resolved, that a single tax on land values would be a desirable form of state and local taxation. Decisions—At Vermillion, S. Dak. Affirmative 4, Drake Negative

1. At Grinnell, Grinnell Affirmative o, S. Dakota Negative
5. At Des Moines, Drake Affirmative vs. Grinnell Negative — no report.

Annual Debate — Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn. Three on teams. Date — March 5, 1915. Place — Vermillion. Question — Resolved, that a single tax on land values would be a desirable form of state and local taxation. Decision — Macalester Affirmative 3 to 0.

Yankton College. Yankton. Congregational. L. C. Sorell, Coach. No report 1915.

Triangular — Huron College and S. Dakota Wesleyan. (See S. Dakota Wesleyan.)

TENNESSEE

Union College. Jackson. Baptist. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Ouachita College, Arkansas.)

University of Tennessee. Knoxville. Non-sectarian. Coach 1915 — Howard Bevis. Manager 1915-16 — Prof. George Herbert Clark.

Triangular — Universities of Georgia and S. Carolina. Two on teams. Date — May 1, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all railroads (both steam and electric) engaged in interstate commerce. Decisions — At Knoxville, Georgia Affirmative o, S. Carolina Negative 3. At Columbia, S. C., Tennessee Affirmative 3, Georgia Negative 2. At Athens, Ga., S. Carolina Affirmative o, Tennessee Negative 3.

Annual Debate — Washington and Lee, Lexington, Va. Two on teams. Date — April 17, 1915. Place — Knoxville, Tenn. Question — Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all railroads (both steam and electric) doing an interstate business. Decision — Washington and Lee Negative 2 to 1.

Vanderbilt University. Nashville. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Prof. A. M. Harris, Coach. Manager 1915 — C. E. Coolidge.

Triangular — Universities of Alabama and Kentucky, Tuscaloosa and Lexington. Two on teams. Date — April 30, 1915. Question — Resolved, that President Wilson was

justified in regarding the illiteracy test as sufficient grounds for vetoing the Burnett Immigration Bill. Decisions—Nashville, Vanderbilt Affirmative 2, Kentucky Negative 1. At Tuscaloosa, Alabama Affirmative 2, Vanderbilt Negative 1. At Lexington, Kentucky Affirmative 1, Alabama Negative 2.

TEXAS

Baylor University. Waco. Baptist. No coach. J. D. Coleman, Sec. Orat. Com. 1915.

Annual Debate—Mercer University, Macon, Ga. Two on teams. Date—May 4, 1915. Place—Macon, Ga. Question—Resolved, that a national board of arbitration, with compulsory powers, should be established to settle disputes between capital and labor. Constitutionality conceded. Decision—Baylor Affirmative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate—Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas. Two on teams. Date—May 4, 1915. Place—Waco. Question—Resolved, that the United States should increase its navy so as to compare favorably with that of any other nation. Decision—Baylor Negative 3 to 0.

Daniel Baker College. Brownwood. Presbyterian. No report 1915.

Quadrangular. (See Trinity University, Texas.)

Southwestern University. Georgetown. Methodist Episcopal. No report 1915.

Quadrangular—See Trinity University, Texas.

Annual Debate. (See Baylor University, Texas.)

Texas Christian University. Ft. Worth. Disciples. No report 1915.

Quadrangular. (See Trinity University, Texas.)

Trinity University. Waxahachie. Presbyterian. Sim Joe Smith, Manager 1915.

Quadrangular—Daniel Baker College, Southwestern University, and Texas Christian University. Two on teams. Date—Feb. 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the President of the United States should be elected for a term of six years and be made ineligible for re-election.

Decisions — At Waxahachie, Trinity Affirmative 2, Texas Christian Negative 1. At Brownwood, Daniel Baker Affirmative 1, Trinity Negative 2. At Georgetown, Southwestern Affirmative 2, Trinity Negative 1.

University of Texas. Austin. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. John R. Pelsma, Coach and Manager.

Triangular — Colorado and Missouri universities. Two on teams. Date — April 2, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt a schedule of minimum wages for unskilled laborers. Constitutionality conceded. Decisions — At Austin, Texas Affirmative 1, Colorado Negative 2. At Columbia, Mo., Missouri Affirmative 2, Texas Negative 1.

Triangular — Louisiana and Arkansas universities. Two on teams. Date — April 9, 1915. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt a minimum wage law for unskilled laborers. Decisions — At Austin, Texas Affirmative 2, Louisiana Negative 1. At Fayetteville, Arkansas Affirmative 2, Texas Negative 1. At Baton Rouge, Louisiana Affirmative 2, Texas Negative 1.

UTAH

Brigham Young University. Provo. Latter Day Saints. John C. Swenson, Coach. Manager 1915-16 — LeRoy Hafen.

Triangular — University of Utah, and Utah Agricultural College. Two on teams. Date — Feb. 20, 1915. Question — Resolved, that a tax on land values should be substituted for the general property tax for city purposes in American cities of over ten thousand inhabitants. Decisions — At Provo, Brigham Young Affirmative 3, University of Utah Negative 0. At Logan, Agricultural College Affirmative 0, Brigham Young Negative 1. At Salt Lake, Utah University Affirmative 1, Agricultural College 2.

Annual Debate — University of Nevada, Reno. Two on teams. Date — Feb. 26, 1915. Place — Provo, Utah. Question — Resolved, that a tax on land values should be substituted for the general property tax for city purposes

in American cities of over ten thousand inhabitants. Decision—University of Nevada Affirmative 1, B. Y. U. Negative 2.

Annual Debate—University of S. California, Los Angeles. Two on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Place—Los Angeles. Question—Resolved, that the nomination of candidates for elective offices of the state governments should be made by popular vote. Decision—Univ. of S. California won 2 to 1.

University of Utah. Salt Lake. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. Charles Wilbert Snow, Coach. Manager 1915—Edwin Spencer. Manager 1916—William Ferguson.

Triangular—Brigham Young University, Provo, and Utah Agricultural College. (See Brigham Young Univ. above.)

Annual Debate—University of Montana, Missoula. Three on teams. Date—March 20, 1915. Place—Missoula. Question—Resolved, that the regulation of monopoly is the best method of dealing with the trust problem in the United States. Decision—Montana Affirmative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate—Univ. of Colorado, Boulder. Three on teams. Date—April 9, 1915. Place—Salt Lake. Question—Resolved, that minimum wage boards for the regulation of the wages of men should be established in the United States. Constitutionality conceded. Decision—Utah Affirmative 2 to 1.

Utah Agricultural College. Logan. Non-sectarian. Prof. George B. Hendricks, Coach. Manager 1915—S. J. Quinney. Manager 1916—J. B. Bearnson.

Triangular—Brigham Young University, Provo, and Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake. (See Brigham Young Univ. above.)

Annual Debate—University of Idaho, Moscow. Two on teams. Date—March 19, 1915. Place—Logan. Question—Resolved, that as long as our federal government maintains a policy of private ownership and operation of railroads, it should permit interstate railways to pool earnings. Decision—Univ. of Idaho Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—University of Denver, Colo. Two on teams. Date—April 16, 1915. Place—Logan. Question—Re-

solved, that the judges of all courts of general and appellate jurisdiction other than federal courts should not gain office by popular vote. Decision — Utah Affirmative 3 to 0.

VIRGINIA

Emory and Henry College. Emory. Methodist Episcopal South. Dr. H. M. Henry, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate — Hampden-Sidney. Two on teams. Date — April 13, 1915. Place — Emory, Va. Question — Resolved, that minimum wage legislation should be applied to the field of the sweated industries. Constitutionality waived. Decision — 2 to 1, for whom report does not say.

Hampden-Sidney. Hampden-Sidney. Presbyterian. No report 1915.

Annual Debate. (See Emory and Henry College, Va.)

Triangular — Randolph-Macon College, and William and Mary College. (See William and Mary College, Va.)

Randolph-Macon. Ashland. Methodist. Tau Kappa Alpha. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See William and Mary College, Va.)

Annual Debate. (See Richmond College, Va.)

Richmond College. Richmond. Baptist. Dr. D. R. Anderson, Coach and Manager.

Dual Debate — Wake Forest, N. Carolina. Two on teams. Date — May 1, 1915. Question — Resolved, that all industrial disputes should be settled by compulsory arbitration. Decisions — At Richmond, Richmond Affirmative 0, Wake Forest Negative 3. At Wake Forest, Wake Forest Affirmative 3, Richmond Negative 0.

Annual Debate — Randolph-Macon College, Ashland. Two on teams. Date — Place — Richmond. Question — Resolved, that the several states should adopt minimum wage laws. Decision — Richmond College Negative 2 to 1.

Roanoke College. Salem. Lutheran. Dr. J. G. Randall, Coach. Manager 1915 — J. W. Campbell.

Annual Debate — William and Mary College, Williamsburg,

Va. Three on teams. Date—April 19, 1915. Place—Williamsburg. Question—Resolved, that the United States should grant the Philippines their independence within the next eight years. Decision—William and Mary Affirmative 3 to 0.

University of Virginia. Charlottesville. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. C. W. Paul, Adjunct Professor, Public Speaking, in charge. Manager 1915—H. L. Carter. Triangular—Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., and Univ. of N. Carolina, Chapel Hill. Two on teams. Date—April 24, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the policy of colonial expansion is desirable for the modern state. Decisions—At Charlottesville, Johns Hopkins Affirmative 5, North Carolina Negative 0. At Chapel Hill, Univ. of Virginia Affirmative 1, Johns Hopkins Negative 4. At Baltimore, Univ. of N. Carolina 5, Virginia Negative 0.

Washington and Lee. Lexington. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Paul D. Converse, Coach. Manager 1915-16—G. D. Hancock.

Annual Debate—Trinity College, Durham, N. Carolina. Three on teams. Date—March 9, 1915. Place—Lexington, Va. Question—Resolved, that the nominating convention is preferable to the direct primary as a means of selecting candidates for public offices to be filled by popular election. (President and Vice-President of the U. S. excluded.) Decision—Washington and Lee Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate—University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Two on teams. Date—April 17, 1915. Place—Knoxville, Tenn. Question—Resolved, that the United States should own and operate all railways (both steam and electric) engaged in interstate commerce. Decision—Washington and Lee Negative 2 to 1.

William and Mary College. Williamsburg. Non-sectarian. No coach. Prof. James S. Wilson, in charge. Manager 1915-16—W. M. Griesley.

Triangular—Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, and Hampden-Sidney College, Va. Two on teams. Date—April 9, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the Philippine Is-

lands should be granted independence within eight years. Decision—At Williamsburg—William and Mary Affirmative 3, Randolph-Macon Negative 0. At Hampden-Sidney, Hampden-Sidney Affirmative 2, William and Mary Negative 1. At Ashland, Randolph-Macon Affirmative vs. Hampden-Sidney Negative—no report.

Annual Debate—Roanoke College, Salem, Va. See Roanoke above.

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound. Tacoma. Phi Alpha Tau. Hugo Paul Selinger, 811 N. Anderson St., Coach. Manager 1915—Paul Todd.

Dual Debate—Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon. Two on teams. Date—April 30, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the initiative and referendum should be incorporated into the statutes of the various states. Decisions—At Tacoma, Puget Sound Affirmative 2, Pacific Negative 1. At Forest Grove, Pacific Affirmative 2, Puget Sound Negative 1.

Gonzaga University. Spokane. R. Catholic. Walter J. Fitzgerald, Dir. Oratory and Debate, and Manager 1916. Manager 1915—Timothy A. Driscoll.

Triangular—University of Montana, Missoula, and Montana Agricultural College, Bozeman. Two on teams. Date—Feb. 19, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the United States should substitute for the Monroe Doctrine as developed and applied an alliance with Argentine, Brazil, and Chile for the defense of Pan-American interests. Decisions—At Spokane, Gonzaga Affirmative 2, Montana State Negative 1. At Missoula, Univ. of Montana Affirmative 0, Gonzaga Negative 3. At Bozeman, Montana State Affirmative 0, Univ. of Montana 3.

Dual Debate—University of Idaho, Moscow. Three on teams. Date—March 5, 1915. Question—Resolved, that as long as our federal government maintains its policy of private ownership and operation of railways, it should permit interstate railways to pool their earnings. Decisions—At Spokane, Gonzaga Affirmative 2, Idaho

Negative 1. At Moscow, Idaho Affirmative 2, Gonzaga
Negative 1.

University of Washington—Spokane. Non-sectarian. Tau Kappa Alpha. William LaFollette, Coach and Manager. No report 1915.

Triangular—Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif., and Univ. of Oregon, Eugene. (See Leland Stanford, Calif.)

Triangular—Whitman College, Walla Walla, and Washington Agricultural, Pullman—no report.

Triangular (Women)—Whitman College, and Washington Agricultural—no report.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College. Bethany. Disciples. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Marietta College, Ohio.)

West Virginia Wesleyan. Buckhannon. Methodist. No report 1915.

Triangular. (See Marietta College, Ohio.)

WISCONSIN

Beloit College. Beloit. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. Clayton D. Crawford, Coach. No report 1915.

Dual Debate. (See Knox College, Illinois.)

Dual Debate. (See Cornell College, Iowa.)

Freshman triangular—Lawrence College, Ripon College. (See Ripon below.)

Carroll College. Waukesha. Presbyterian. Phi Alpha Tau. No report 1915.

Lawrence College. Appleton. Methodist Episcopal. Tau Kappa Alpha. F. Wesley Orr, Coach. No report 1915.

Freshman triangular—Beloit and Ripon colleges, Wis. (See Ripon.)

Ripon College. Ripon. Non-sectarian. Pi Kappa Delta. Prof. R. L. Lyman, in charge 1915. Prof. Henry P. Boody, Prof. of Public Speaking; in charge 1916. Manager 1915—W. A. Zinzow. Manager 1916—Delmar D. Wensink.

Triangular—Coe College, Iowa, and Northwestern College,

Naperville, Ill. Three on teams. Date—April 22, 23, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the government own and operate all interstate railways. Decisions—At Ripon, Northwestern Affirmative 2, Ripon Negative 1. At Cedar Rapids, Ripon Affirmative 0, Coe Negative 3. At Naperville, Coe Affirmative 0, Northwestern Negative 3.

Freshman Triangular—Beloit College and Lawrence College. Three on teams. Date—May 6, 1915. Question—Resolved, that the parcel post be extended to include the entire express business. Decisions—At Ripon, Ripon Affirmative 2, Beloit Negative 1. At Appleton, Lawrence Affirmative 2, Ripon Negative 1. At Beloit, Beloit Affirmative vs. Lawrence Negative—no report.

State Normal. Stevens Point. Non-sectarian. M. M. Ames, Coach and Manager.

Annual Debate—Oshkosh Normal, Wis. Three on teams. Date—March 26, 1915. Place—Oshkosh. Question—Resolved, that it should be the policy of the United States to strengthen materially (100% increase in strength) its military and naval establishments. Decision—Stevens Point Normal Affirmative 3 to 0.

Annual Debate—Beaver Falls Normal, Wis. Three on teams. Date—May 14, 1915. Place—Stevens Point. Question—Resolved, that it should be the policy of the United States to strengthen materially (100% increase in strength) its military and naval establishments. Decision—Beaver Falls Normal Affirmative 2 to 1.

University of Wisconsin. Madison. Non-sectarian. Delta Sigma Rho. No report 1915.

Pentangular. (See Univ. of Minnesota.)

WYOMING

University of Wyoming. Laramie. Non-sectarian. R. B. Pease, Coach. Manager 1916—Bernard Howell.

Annual Debate—Colorado Agricultural College, Ft. Collins. Three on teams. Date—April 30, 1915. Place—Laramie. Question—Resolved, that all able-bodied male citizens of the United States should have one year's com-

compulsory military training. Decision — Univ. of Wyoming
Negative 2 to 1.

Annual Debate — Univ. of Denver, Colo. Three on teams.
Date — May 6, 1915. Place — Denver. Question — Re-
solved, that all able-bodied male citizens of the United
States should have one year's compulsory military train-
ing. Decision — Wyoming Affirmative 2 to 1.

APPENDIX II

Table showing the number of times various debate subjects were discussed in 1914-15, and the number of Affirmative and Negative decisions.

SUBJECT.	NO. TIMES DEBATED	DECISION		NOT GIVEN	NOT DECIDED
		AFF.	NEG.		
Annexation of Mexico	2	2			
Annuling, Act of Cong. by Decision Sup. Ct.	1	1			
Arbitration, Compulsory	6	4	2		
Child labor, federal restriction of	2	1	1		
Colonial expansion desirable	4	2	1		1
Commission legislature for states	2	1	1		
Compulsory military service	5	4	1		
Direct primary vs. convention	1		1		
Federal charter for corporations	1		1		
Germany justified in declaring war	2		2		
Government ownership, merchant marine..	4	3	1		
Government ownership, railroads	34	13	19	4	
Government ownership, telegraph and telephone	10	6	3	1	
Immigration, literacy test	11	6	5		
Immigration to the south and agriculture Total immigration	3	1	1	1	
Increase of army and navy	24	5	15	4	
Initiative and referendum	5	4	1		
Insurance, Compulsory Accident	1		1		
Judges, popular election of	3	2		1	

SUBJECT.	NO. TIMES DEBATED	DECISION AFF. NEG.		NOT GIVEN	NOT DECIDED
Jury, substitute judges for	2			2	
Labor unions, exempt from anti-trust law	7	2	4	1	
Minimum wage	25	13	7	5	
Monroe Doctrine, abandonment of and sub- stitution of league with A. B. C. powers	43	17	21	5	
Parliamentary vs. Presidential form of gov't	3	1	2		
Parcel post vs. express	3	2	1		
Philippine Islands, Independence of	22	10	10	2	
Pooling railroad earnings	3	2	1		
Preferential voting	2		2		
President, six year single term	4	2	1	1	
Prohibition	3		3		
Ship subsidy	9	8	1		
Short ballot	3	2		1	
Single tax	21	7	11	3	
Socialism	7	3	1	3	
Suffrage, Woman	1	1			
Trusts, Regulation of	1	1			
Unicameral state legislature	2	1	1		
Uniform marriage and divorce laws	3	1	1	1	

APPENDIX III

List of subjects debated in 1914-15 with institutions taking part in debates and kind of debate arrangement. Affirmative named first in single debates.

	KIND	AFF. NEG.	NO DECISION
Annexation of Mexico			
Kansas Normal vs. Northwest- ern Normal (Okla.)	Dual	2	
Annulling Act of Cong. by De- cision Supreme Ct.			
Occidental vs. Whittier (Calif.)	Single	1	
Arbitration, Compulsory			
Fairmount, Friends, Southwest- ern, Kansas	Triangular	2	1
Baylor (Tex.) vs. Mercer (Ga.)	Single	1	
Wake Forest (N. C.), Richmond (Va.)	Dual	1	1
Child Labor, federal restriction of			
Simpson vs. Morningside (Iowa)	Dual	1	1
Colonial Expansion desirable			
Johns Hopkins (Md.), Univ. of Va., Univ. of N. C.	Triangular	2	1
Johns Hopkins vs. Univ. of Pa.	Single		1
Commission legislature for states			
William Jewell (Mo.) vs. Colo- rado College	Single	1	
Colorado College vs. Univ. of Denver	Single		1

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.
Compulsory Military Training			
Colo., Kans., and Okla. Agri.			
Colleges	Triangular	3	
Colo. Agri. vs. Univ. of Wyoming	Single	1	
Univ. of Wyoming vs. Univ. of Denver	Single	1	
Direct primary vs. convention			
Trinity College (N. C.) vs. Washington & Lee (Va.)....	Single	1	
Federal Charter for corporations			
Wm. Jewell (Mo.) vs. Kans. Wesleyan	Single	1	
Germany justified in declaring war			
Tulane (La.) vs. Univ. of Pennsylvania	Single	1	
Tulane vs. Alabama Polytechnic	Single	1	
Government Ownership of Merchant Marine			
Univ. of S. Calif. vs. Univ. of Redlands	Single	1	
Univ. of S. Calif. vs. Throop College (Tech.)	Single	1	
Univ. of S. Calif. vs. L. A. Junior College	Single	1	
Boston Coll. vs. Georgetown Univ. (D. C.)	Single	1	
Government ownership of railroads			
Stanford (Cal.), Univ. of Ore., Univ. of Wash.	Triangular	1	1
Universities of S. Car., Ga. and Tenn.	Triangular	1	2

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.
Coe Coll. (Ia.), Ripon (Wis.), Northwestern (Ill.)	Triangular	1	2
Penn, Parsons, Des Moines colleges (Iowa)	Triangular	2	1
Coe Coll., Morningside, Iowa Teachers' (Iowa)	Triangular	2	1
Morningside (Ia.) vs. Southwestern (Kans.)	Single		1
Southwestern (Kans.) vs. Coll. of Emporia (Kans.)	Single	1	
Phillips Univ. (Okla.) vs. Southwestern (Kans.)	Single		1
Kingfisher Coll. (Okla.) vs. Phillips (Okla.)	Single		1
Carleton, Gustavus Adolphus, Macalester, Hamline, and St. Olaf (Minn.)	Pentangular	4	1
Macalester (Minn.), Huron (S. Dak.) Fargo (N. Dak.)	Triangular	3	
Univ. of Montana vs. Univ. of Oregon	Single		1
Bellevue, Cotner, Doane (Nebraska)	Triangular	1	1
Doane vs. Nebraska Wesleyan.	Single		1
Willamette (Ore.) vs. Ore. Agri. Coll.	Single		1
Tennessee vs. Washington and Lee (Va.)	Single		1
Government ownership of railroads and mines in Alaska			
Oklahoma Agri. Coll. vs. Okla. Methodist Univ.	Single		1
Okla. Methodist Univ. vs. Friends Univ. (Kans.)	Single		1

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	
Government ownership of telegraph and telephone				
Oklahoma Univ. vs. Arkansas Univ.	Single	I		
Butler Coll. vs. Wabash Coll. (Ind.)	Single	I		
Wabash Coll. vs. Earlham Coll. (Ind.)	Single	I		
Kansas Agri. Coll. vs. Kans. Normal	Single	I		
Kans. Normal vs. Coll. of Emporia (Kans.)	Single	I		
Clark Coll. (Mass.), Tufts (Mass.), Bates (Me.)	Triangular	2		I
Ohio State Univ. vs. Indiana Univ.	Dual	I	I	
Immigration, Literacy test				
Kansas Agri. Coll.; Iowa State, S. Dak. Univ.	Triangular	I	2	
Kansas Agri. Coll. vs. Kans. Wesleyan	Dual	2		
College of Emporia vs. Ottawa Univ. (Kans.)	Single	I		
Davidson Coll. (N. C.) vs. Clemson Coll. (S. C.)	Single	I		
Lincoln (Pa.) vs. Wilberforce (Ohio)	Single	I		
Alabama, Vanderbilt, Kentucky universities	Triangular	2	I	
Immigration to South and agriculture				
Georgia Univ., Ala. Poly., N. C. Agri.	Triangular	I	I	I

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DECISION
Increase of Army and Navy				
Harvard, Yale, Princeton	Triangular	1	1	1
Howard Coll. (D. C.) Men's				
Round Table (New York)..	Single		1	
Bowdoin (Me.), Hamilton, (N.				
Y.), Wesleyan (Conn.).....	Triangular		3	
Universities — Cornell, Colum-				
bia, Pennsylvania	Triangular		3	
Cornell vs. Syracuse (N. Y.) ..	Single		1	
New York Univ., Trinity				
(Conn.), Rutgers (N. J.)	Triangular	1	1	1
Denison, Cincinnati, Ohio Univ.				
(Athens), and Miami Univ.				
(Ohio)	Quadrangular	2	1	
Marietta (Ohio), Bethany (W.				
Va.), W. Va. Wesleyan	Triangular		2	1
Southwestern Univ. (Tex.) vs.				
Baylor (Tex.)	Single		1	
Stevens Point Normal (Wis.)				
vs. Oshkosh Normal	Single		1	
Stevens Point Normal vs. Bea-				
ver Falls Normal (Wisconsin) Single			1	
Initiative and referendum				
Univ. of Calif. vs. Stanford				
(Calif.)	Single		1	
N. Dak. Agri. vs. Univ. of S.				
Calif.	Single		1	
Pacific University vs. Puget				
Sound (Oregon)	Dual		2	
Referendum of people for declar-				
ing war				
Occidental Coll. vs. Univ. of S.				
Calif.	Single		1	

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DECISION
Insurance, Compulsory accident				O
Cooper Coll. vs. Bethel Coll. (Kansas)	Single			
Judges, Popular election of			I	
Univ. of S. Calif. Law vs. Univ. of Denver	Single		I	
Utah Agri. Coll. vs. Univ. of Denver	Single		I	
Brigham Young Univ. (Utah) vs. U. S. Calif.	Single		I	
Jury, Abandon for Judges			I	
Highland Park (Ia.) vs. Iowa Teachers' Coll.	Dual			2
Labor Unions, exemption from anti-trust law				
Monmouth, Augustana, Illinois Colleges (Ill.)	Triangular	2	I	
Universities of Mich., Ill. and Wis.	Triangular	2	I	
Hillsdale vs. Albion (Mich.) ...	Single	I		
Minimum wage				
Union Coll. (Tenn.) vs. Oua- chita Coll. (Arkans.)	Single		I	
Universities of Arkans., Tex., and La.	Triangular	3		
Universities of Ill., Ia., Minn., Nebr. and Wis.	Pentangular	I	I	3
Drury Coll. vs. Park Coll. (Missouri)	Single		I	
North Dak. Agri. vs. S. Dak. Agri.	Dual	2		
Furman Coll. (S. Car.) vs. Mercer (Ga.)	Single	I		

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	
Dak. Wesleyan, Huron, Yankton (S. Dakota)	Triangular	2	1	
Huron Coll. vs. S. Dak. Agri... Dual		2		
Huron Coll. vs. S. Dak. Normal	Single		1	
Universities of Colo., Mo., and Texas	Triangular	1	1	1
Univ. of Colo. vs. Univ. of Utah Single		1		
Emory and Henry (Va.) vs. Hampden-Sidney (Va.)	Single			1
Randolph-Macon vs. Richmond Coll. (Va.)	Single		1	
Monroe Doctrine, abandonment of and substitution of league with A. B. C. powers				
Central Coll. (Mo.) vs. Hendrix Coll. (Arkans.)	Single	1		
Pomona Coll. vs. Univ. of Red- lands (Calif.)	Single	1		
Emory Coll. (Ga.) vs. Furman Univ. (S. Car.)	Single	1		
Davidson Coll. (N. Car.) vs. Emory Coll. (Ga.)	Single	1		
Cooper vs. McPherson Coll. (Kansas)	Single	1		
Harvard, Yale, Princeton Fresh- men	Triangular	2	1	
Univ. of Kansas vs. Univ. of Missouri	Single	1		
Mich. Univ., Chicago Univ., Northwestern U.	Triangular	2		1
Drury Coll. vs. Wm. Jewell Coll. (Mo.)	Single	1		

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DECISION
Univ. of Mont., Mont. Agri., Gonzaga U. (Wash.)	Triangular	1	2	
Univ. of Mont. vs. Univ. of N. Dak.	Single	1		
Grand Island Coll. vs. Hastings Coll. (Nebr.)	Single	1		
Trinity (N. Car.) vs. Swarth- more (Pa.)	Single	1		
Univ. of N. Dak. vs. Univ. of Manitoba	Single	1		
Heidelberg, Hiram, Baldwin- Wallace (Ohio)	Triangular	2		1
Heidelberg vs. Univ. of Detroit (Ohio)	Dual	1	1	
Dickinson, Franklin and Mar- shall, State Coll. and Swarth- more (Pa.)	Quadrangular	2	2	
Geneva, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Westminster (Pa.)	Triangular	1	2	
Swarthmore vs. Juniata Coll. (Pa.)	Single	1		
Univ. of Pittsburgh, State Coll., Washington and Jefferson (Pa.)	Triangular	2	1	
Washington and Jefferson vs. Westminster (Pa.)	Single	1		
Westminster vs. State College (Pa.)	Single	1		
Furman (S. C.) vs. Wofford (S. C.)	Single	1		
Beloit Coll. (Wis.) vs. Knox Coll. (Ill.)	Dual	1	1	
Beloit Coll. vs. Cornell Coll. (Iowa)	Dual	2		

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.
Municipal ownership of public utilities			
Univ. of N. Mexico vs. N. Mexico Agri. Coll.	Single	1	
Univ. of N. Mexico vs. Las Vegas Normal	Single		2
Parliamentary vs. Presidential form of govt			
Charleston, Clemson, Wofford (S. Car.)	Triangular	1	2
Parcel post vs. express			
Beloit, Ripon, Lawrence fresh-men (Wis.)	Triangular	2	1
Philippines, independence of			
Howard (D. C.), Fisk (Tenn.), Atlanta (Ga.)	Triangular	2	1
Buena Vista, Central, Ellsworth (Iowa)	Triangular	2	1
Cooper Coll. vs. Friends Univ. (Kansas)	Dual	2	
Kansas Agri. Coll. vs. Washburn Coll. (Kans.)	Dual	1	1
Kansas Agri. Coll. vs. Baker Univ. (Kansas)	Dual	1	1
Baker, Ottawa, Washburn colleges (Kansas)	Triangular	2	1
Allegheny (Pa.), Univ. of Pittsburgh, Wooster (Ohio)	Triangular	2	
Wm. and Mary vs. Roanoke (Va.)	Single	1	
Wm. and Mary, Randolph-Macon, Hampden-Sidney (Va.)	Triangular	2	1

	KIND	AFF. NEG.	NO DECISION
Pooling railroad earnings			
Utah Agri. vs. Idaho Univ. ... Single		I	
Gonzaga Univ. (Wash.), vs.			
Univ. of Idaho Dual	2		
Preferential voting			
Pomona Coll. (Calif.) vs. U. S.			
Calif. Dual	2		
Prohibition			
Syracuse vs. Yale Dual	2		
Cooper Coll. vs. Kansas City			
Univ. (Kansas) Single	I		
Ship subsidy			
Hillsdale Coll., Kalamazoo			
Coll., Hope Coll. (Mich.)... Triangular	3		
Hope Coll., Alma Coll., Olivet			
Coll. (Mich.) Triangular	2	I	
Mich. State Normal, Central			
State Normal, Ferris Institute			
(Mich.) Triangular	3		
Short ballot			
Iowa Wesleyan, Upper Iowa,			
Simpson (Ia.) Triangular	2		I
Single tax			
Pomona, Occidental, Univ. of S.			
Calif. (Calif.) Triangular	3		
J. Milliken, Eureka, Illinois			
Wesleyan (Ill.) Triangular	I	I	I
Universities of Kans., Colo.,			
Okla. Triangular	I	I	I
Univ. of Maine vs. Colby			
(Me.) Dual	I	I	
Macalester (Minn.) vs. Grinnell (Ia.)	Single	I	
Macalester vs. Univ. of S. Dak. Single	I		

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.	NO DECISION
Univ. of Nev. vs. Brigham Young (Utah)	Single		I	
Univ. of Nev. vs. Coll. of Pacific (Calif.)	Single		I	
Drake (Ia.), Grinnell (Ia.), S. Dak. Univ.	Triangular	I	I	I
Univ. of Utah, Utah Agri., Brigham Young (Utah)	Triangular	I	2	
Six year term for president				
Trinity, Southwestern, Texas Christian, and Daniel Baker (Texas)	Quadrangular	2	I	I
Socialism				
Colgate Univ. (N. Y.), Univ. of Rochester (N. Y.), Ohio Wesleyan	Triangular	2	I	
Colgate Univ. vs. Ohio Wesleyan	Second Debate	I		
Colgate Univ. vs. St. Lawrence Univ. (N. Y.)	Single	I		
Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Western Reserve (Ohio)	Triangular			3
Univ. of Rochester (N. Y.) vs. Allegheny (Pa.)	Single	I		
Suffrage, Woman				
Ouachita Coll. (Arkans.) vs. Centenary Coll. (La.)	Single	I		
Trusts, Regulation of				
Univ. of Mont. vs. Univ. of Utah Single		I		
Unicameral state legislature				
Univ. of Denver vs. Kansas Wesleyan	Single		I	
Ottawa Univ. vs. Kansas Wesleyan	Single	I		

NO DECISION

	KIND	AFF.	NEG.
Uniform marriage and divorce law			
Wm. and Vashti Coll., Hedding Triangular Coll., Carthage Coll. (Illinoi- nois)		1	1

INDEX TO THIS VOLUME

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATES, VOL. VI.

	PAGE
COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE	317
Affirmative	319, 332, 343, 346
Negative	350, 358, 368, 371
Bibliography	374
Adequacy of	335, 358
Arbitration	320
Benefit to the men trained	338
Breeds distrust	352
Commercial war	339
Comparison of systems	366
Condition of navy	330, 363, 367
Cost of	336-7, 348, 354, 370-71
Danger of war	322
Defense of Panama Canal	327
Definition	321
Economic superiority of	345
Effectiveness of	360
European strength after the war	331
Foreign population	326
Friendship of nations	353
Gospel of hatred	351-52
Hawaii a danger	323
Historical sketch	321
Industrial education while under arms	340, 370
Initiation of the question	319
Inquisitorial features	354
Is just	345
Isolation of the United States	324
Japan menaces us	322-24
Militia	329
Monroe Doctrine	322
Number of men affected by	333
Number of men needed for defense	328-329
One year plan	348, 359, 369
Philippine Islands	323

	PAGE
Preparedness	325, 336, 351
Present army, size of	328-329
Present force sufficient	327
Principle of compulsion	346
Race supremacy	326
Reserve system	334-35, 362, 370-71
Result of volunteer system	331
Strength of treaties	320
Un-American	350
Volunteer system	331, 343, 351, 361, 371
War spirit	354
War staff plan	364, 369-70
World peace and	347, 352, 367
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS	383
Affirmative	383, 389, 396, 403, 406, 410
Negative	415, 421, 427, 435, 437, 441
Abuses in present system	384
Affirmative plan for	392, 406, 438-39
Bond issue	392
Bureau of railroad economics	437
Canadian experience	426
Capitalization	388, 415, 435
Civil service	392, 393, 422-23
Comparison with Germany	390, 416, 418-19
Competition	401-02, 431, 432
Consolidation and monopoly	402-03, 412, 431
Democracy and government ownership	417
Discrimination	420-21, 429, 444
Efficient labor	407
Efficiency of service	400, 412, 417
Experience of our government with railroads	409
Experience of other governments	426, 445
Example of Panama Canal	393
Example of the Post Office department	393
Failure of government ownership	403-04
Federal incorporation	404-05, 411, 432
Government ownership undesirable	421
Gradual assumption of ownership	391
Improvement and extension	417-18, 423
Knapp plan	392, 406, 438-39
Labor	407, 422
Limitation of regulation	400
Necessity of government ownership	414
Political corruption and influence	385, 395, 406, 421, 440, 443
Pooling	412, 430, 432
Profit	398

	PAGE
Railroad districts	392
Railroads fight regulation	399
Rates 387, 396, 411, 417-18, 419-20, 433, 436	399
Regulation	399, 413, 428, 433, 440-42
Stock manipulation	386, 395, 410, 443
Transportation a public service	398
United States railroad system	383
Wages and rates	396, 427
Would increase operating expenses	424
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF THE MERCHANT MARINE	203
Affirmative	203, 211, 217, 221
Negative	225, 234
Bibliography	242
Admeasurement laws	230
Auxiliaries	208, 228
Benefits of	212
Cost	219, 238
Dangerous to United States	232-33
Demand for	222, 232
Discrimination	220
Evils in shipping	212-13
Expediency of	232
Failure of private capital	204, 214, 229
Foreign competition	241
Government as a commercial executive	216
is public function	206, 235
is public duty	208
Issues involved	203, 219, 225-26
Method of obtaining ships	222, 231, 237
Navigation laws	223, 230, 242
Need of	223, 227, 232
Operation	222, 236
Opposition of ship owners	209-10
Practicable	215, 235
Precedent for	222, 226, 235
Profit or loss	215, 229, 240
Standard of seamen's living	224
Subsidy	205
United States line to Panama	213
War emergency	229
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE	3
Affirmative	3, 10, 15, 24, 27, 31
Negative	37, 42, 49, 56, 59, 63
Bibliography	67
Comparison with	
Australia	65

	PAGE
Canada	53
England	9, 52
France	50, 58
Germany	50
Countries having government ownership of telegraph and telephone	18
Delay in government ownership	46
Demand for	34
Efficient personnel in government ownership	26-27, 30, 46
Efficiency of government owned systems	44, 45, 49, 53
Efficiency of private service	64
Evils of present system	4, 33, 49
Experience of U. S. in government ownership of telephone	20-2, 54
Extent of system in U. S.	16, 26, 41, 57, 60
Extent, as compared with Europe	26, 27, 28, 29, 40, 44, 50
Extension and improvement	9, 11, 25, 30, 31-32, 43
Failure of government ownership of telephone, etc.	50
Financial failure of government ownership of telephone	24, 34, 44
Government's policy service	12, 13, 43
History government ownership of telephone and telegraph	3, 20-21
Issues	4, 37
Labor	63-64
Necessary	5, 38
Public Utility monopoly	11
Physical valuation	8
Profits	7, 12, 59, 60
Per cent. of messages per capita	9
Postal function	33
Post office and telephone and telegraph	10, 14-15, 57, 58, 63
Paternalistic	30
Political influence of a	25, 29, 47, 59
Private ownership and continuous policy	43
Private business incentive	42-43
Relationship of telegraph and telephone	16-17
Rates	5-8, 18, 24, 39, 56-57, 61
Rates of European countries, comparison with	18-19, 24, 56-57, 61
Rates for press service	8
Rates and service	19, 29, 39
Regulation	28, 55
Watered stock	7, 32, 62
MINIMUM WAGE	71
Affirmative	73, 82, 90

	PAGE
Negative	99, 107, 117, 129, 133, 137, 143, 147, 149
Bibliography	153
Apprentices	92
Basis of wages	77, 80, 108, 111
Better remedy	123
Child labor	88, 147
Collective bargaining	78, 142
Comparative conditions in Australia and the U. S.	95, 96
Definition	73, 74
Degeneracy	88-89, 143
Dependent workers	88
Diminishing returns	138
Drastic	101
Effect on migration to cities	113
Employers and	84, 140-41
Enforcing minimum wage	94, 144
Factory legislation	75
Freedom of contract	116
History of minimum wage	75, 109, 131
Human subsidy	85, 157
Increases immigration	114, 134, 147
Inelastic	105, 112
Labor is opposed	106
Living wage	79, 80, 112, 130, 150
Living wage, service and efficiency	84, 93, 114, 130, 133
Minimum will become maximum	92, 115
Normal worker	183
Parasitism	85, 87
Paternalistic	117, 131, 143
Poverty	104
Production of labor	135
Public and	86
Skilled labor	82
Social problems	88
Strikes and	115
Subnormal labor	88, 91
Sweated industry	79
Unskilled labor	84, 103
Wages	108
Wages in the U. S.	80, 100
Wages and efficiency	83, 133, 134, 135
Would throw laborers out of employment	110, 130, 131, 138, 146
SHIP SUBSIDY	247
Affirmative	249, 256, 263, 270, 274, 278
Negative	280, 288, 295, 302, 306, 309

	PAGE
Bibliography	312
American enterprise	269-70
Artificial	301
Balance of trade	285-86
Benefit to the people	267-68
Coastwise ships	273, 275, 290
Commercial need	263-4, 270, 292, 295-6
Congestion in ports	283
Cost of ship building in U. S.	257, 269, 293, 295, 299
Cost of ship subsidy plan	266
Cunard Co. subsidy	298
Danger of war	289, 296
Danger of merchant marine to U. S.	306
Demands of trade	252
Duration of subsidy	268
Economically wrong	297, 301
Emergency	255, 256, 281, 303
Exports of United States	286
Foreign ships carry U. S. trade	294
Foreign ships discriminate against U. S. shippers	267
Government ownership of merchant marine	278-79, 309
Guarantee of ship mortgages	260, 278, 310
Indirect subsidy	250
Insurance	283
Interned ships	287
Kills invention and improved service	298-99
Lack of merchant marine	257
Market for surplus output	267
Merchant marine a weakness in war	290-91
Naval auxiliaries	251, 268, 272, 289, 291, 304
Need of merchant marine	250, 263-64, 270, 281, 285
Operation, cost of in U. S.	258, 269, 298
Plan of subsidy	259, 265, 276
Present carrying capacity	257
Rates	281
Rate increase	255, 298
Return cargoes	284
Risks of navigation	282
Scarcity of ships	255
Shipping board	262, 310
Subsidy graft	310
Trade follows the flag	292-93
Undemocratic	297
Unjust in administration	297
Wages in Europe and the U. S.	269, 300

	PAGE
SINGLE TAX	159
Affirmative	161, 167, 173
Negative	179, 185, 191
Bibliography	197
Ability to pay	180
Adequacy	176, 187
Assessing of present tax	174
Based on values created by society	165, 182
Confiscatory	188
Definition	162
Discourages speculation	170
Discriminates	183
Double taxation	168
Encourages industry	163
Exemptions	183, 192
Experience with	177, 193
False economically	185
Inequality of working	185-186
Inelastic	187
Issues	161, 179-180
Justice of	161, 181-182
Land monopoly discouraged	169
Mortgages and assessment	168
Practicability	185-186, 191
Present tax encourages dishonesty	175
Restriction of industry	163, 192
Shifting incidence	171
Social significance of	169-170, 171
Tax reforms	195
Tax collection	174
Tax upon wealth	164
Theory of	163, 180
Unearned increment	166

GENERAL INDEX

TO THE FIRST SIX VOLUMES OF INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATES.

	PAGE
ABANDONMENT OF MONROE DOCTRINE (see under Monroe Doctrine, Vol. V).	
ACCIDENT INSURANCE (see Insurance).	
ALASKAN CONSERVATION	Vol. II. 261
ALDRICH MONETARY PLAN	Vol. III. 359, 362, 370
ANNEXATION OF CUBA	Vol. I. 391
Affirmative	391, 393, 395
Negative	396, 398, 399
Annexation of Cuba	
America responsible for Cuba	392, 396
Bibliography	401
Cuban independence	392, 396-7, 400
Cuba's prosperity	398
Cuban rebellion	397
Economic basis for	391-2
Necessary to the world's business interests.....	394, 396
Not desired by America	398
Not a military necessity	399
Protectorate a failure	392, 395
APPOINTMENT VS. ELECTION OF JUDGES	Vol. I. 345
Affirmative	345, 347
Negative	350, 356
Appointment vs. election of judges	
Appointment by executive or legislature subordinates judiciary	353
Appointment fixes responsibility	346
Bibliography	363
Courts, the highest power over legislation	352
Dangers of appointment	354
Election educational.....	355
Election dangerous	347-8, 360
Election is democratic	351-2
Executive will choose better men than electors.....	346
Historical sketch of appointment plan.....	350

	PAGE
Independence of judges	348
Length of term	348, 356, 362
Non-Partisan nominations	357
Politics and judges	359
Present state systems of choosing judges	351
APPRENTICES IN LABOR UNIONS	Vol. III. 212
ARMED INTERVENTION FOR THE COLLECTION OF DEBTS	Vol. I. 223
Affirmative	223, 226, 229
Negative	233, 235, 236, 238
Armed Intervention	
and Monroe Doctrine	229
and world peace	226, 228, 230
Arbitration	226-7, 230, 234
Bad policy	223
Beneficial policy	237
Bibliography	239
Case of 1903	226
Causes delay in payment	224, 228
Definition	223, 233-4
Encourages conquest and aggression	229
Is illegal	225
Strong vs. weak	224
The Hague Conference law	226, 235
Unjust claims	224-5
Unjust use of power	224
Venezuela	230, 232, 234, 235
ASSET CURRENCY (see Central Bank)	Vol. I. 191
Affirmative	191, 192, 194
Negative	194, 196
Asset Currency	
Bank reserves	196
Bibliography	197
Currency redemption	194
Elasticity of	192
Need of	192-3, 195
Safety of	193, 195
Suffolk system	192
BANKING (see Asset Currency, Central Bank, Guarantee of Deposits, Bank Notes).	
BANK NOTES SECURED BY COMMERCIAL PAPER	Vol. I. 34
Affirmative	I, 8, 13, 32
Negative	I7, 22, 27, 32
Bank Notes	
Asset currency	2, 28
Bank failures	II, 20

	PAGE
Bibliography	34
Bonds, bond system	I, 4, 5, 13, 23, 24, 25
Canadian system	4, 6, II, 14
Credit currency	20
Plan for	9, 14, 18
Currency stability	8, 9, 28
Discount rate	12
Elasticity	3, 5, 7, 23
English system	22, 23
National bank notes	I, 13
Panic, cause of	18, 21, 33
Panic of 1907	4
Speculation	19
Suffolk system	15, 16, 19
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES	Vol. I. xi
34, 55, 89, 107, 123, 137, 143, 159, 186, 197, 219, 239, 258, 290, 297, 321, 341, 363, 372, 386, 401, 431, 437, 476, 495. Vol. II. 52, 121, 181, 229, 279, 313. Vol. III. 38, 76, 183, 226, 308, 337, 384. Vol. IV. 49, 141, 187, 245, 296, 373, 411, 515. Vol. V. 50, 147, 216, 275, 323, 392, 435. Vol. VI. 67, 153, 197, 242, 312, 374.	
BRIBERY AND GRAFT. Vol. I. 475. Vol. II. 289, 298, 349, 355-6. Vol. III. 4-5, 14, 24, 30, 355-6.	
CABINET OFFICERS IN CONGRESS	Vol. IV. I
Affirmative	3, II, 19
Negative	27, 34, 42
and committee system in congress	15, 20, 29, 33, 36, 39-40
—Bryce on committee system	30, 36, 37, 38
—Hinsdale on committee system	33
and English parliamentary system	42, 46, 48
and the national budget	25
and political complexion of congress	45, 46
and presidential policies	18, 19
and special messages	31
and the veto	25
Bibliography	49
Checks and balances under	5, 8
Communication between departments	7, 8, 9, 12, 40
—Gov. Cox, of Ohio, on communication of departments	41
—Justice Story on	12
Coöperation of congress and executive	
5, 6, 7, 20, 31, 33, 37, 41	41
—Pres. Wilson on coöperation of departments—10, 19, 26	
—Burke on coöperation in government	18
—Bagehot on	28

	PAGE
—Chancellor Kent on	39
Danger of	38, 45, 46, 47
Efficiency of	20-23, 35, 41, 48
Examples showing the necessity of	20, 21, 22
Executive aid in legislation	4-5, 35-36
—Pres. A. L. Lowell on executive in legislation.....	44
Historical sketch of	3
Judiciary as a check	6
Locating responsibility under.....	16, 17, 18, 48
Montesquieu's theory	6
Pendleton bills for	1, 2, 12
Publicity in government	II, 13-14, 15, 31-32
Position of cabinet officers	28-29, 46-47
Relation of departments, Madison on.....	5, 6
—Montesquieu's theory	6
Separation of departments	3, 8, 28
—Burke on	45
—Hinsdale on	28
—President Butler, of Columbia University, on.....	23
Territorial representation in congress	9
Would unify legislation	24
CANADA	
Vol. I. 4, 6, II, 14, 450. Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 372, 381	
CARD INDEX	Vol. I. xi-xii. Vol. II. xiv
CHILD LABOR	Vol. I. 440
CONSTITUTIONALITY	Vol. I. 46
CENTRAL BANK	Vol. I. 325. Vol. III. 341
Affirmative	
Vol. I. 325, 328, 330. Vol. III. 341, 350, 359, 362	
Negative	Vol. I. 333, 336, 339. Vol. III. 367, 373, 379
Central Bank	
Aldrich plan	Vol. III. 359, 362, 370
and congress	Vol. I. 334
and fiscal system of United States...Vol. III. 350, 352-3, 356	
and gold standard	Vol. I. 330, 331
and good business method	Vol. III. 343, 351, 354
Asset currency	Vol. I. 2, 28, 191, 332. Vol. III. 356
—need of	Vol. I. 192-3, 195
—safety of	Vol. I. 193, 195
Bank failures	Vol. I. 11, 20
Bank growth and public confidence.....	Vol. III. 374-5
Bank reserves	Vol. III. 345, 368, 382
Bibliography	Vol. I. 34. Vol. III. 384
Bond Currency (see National bank notes).....	Vol. I. 331
Bonds, and bond system (see National bank system)....	
Vol. I. 1, 4, 5, 13, 23, 24, 25, 32	

	PAGE
Canadian system.....
Vol. I. 4, 6, II, 14	Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 372, 381
Credit Currency (see Asset Currency)
Vol. I. 20.	Vol. III. 342, 358
—plan for	Vol. I. 9, 14, 18
Currency redemption	Vol. I. 194
Currency stability	Vol. I. 8, 9, 28
Currency system, the present	Vol. III. 342-3, 374
Dangerous tyranny	Vol. III. 371, 372, 378
Definition	Vol. III. 359-60-61
Discount rate	Vol. I. 12, Vol. III. 349
Distribution of public funds	Vol. III. 355
Elasticity
Vol. I. 3, 5, 7, 23, 192, 327.	Vol. III. 344, 368, 369, 380, 381
Emergency currency, Treat plan	Vol. III. 381
English Bank. Vol. I. 22, 23, 332, 339, 340.	Vol. III. 369, 372
French Bank	Vol. III. 356, 372
German Bank	Vol. I. 332, 339, 340, Vol. III. 356, 372
Government control of	Vol. I. 336, 338, 339
Government extravagance	Vol. III. 343
Government indebtedness	Vol. III. 342, 343
Historical sketch, national banks	Vol. I. 325
In politics	Vol. III. 357, 376
Lack of confidence in present system.....	Vol. I. 326-7
Lack of control in present system	Vol. I. 326-7
Lack of coöperation in present system.....	Vol. I. 326-7
Monopoly control	Vol. III. 358, 361, 377
National bank notes	Vol. I. 1, 13, Vol. III. 342, 344
National bank system	Vol. III. 354, 375
New York	Vol. III. 377
Panics	Vol. I. 4, 18, 21, 33, 309, 319, Vol. III. 349, 367
Panic of 1907	Vol. I. 4, Vol. III. 353
People do not want a central bank	Vol. III. 370
Plan for	Vol. I. 328, Vol. III. 347, 373, 376
Pork barrel method of distributing government funds..
	Vol. III. 355-56
Seasonal demand for money	Vol. III. 343, 348
Second U. S. national bank	Vol. III. 357, 371, 380
Sectional objection	Vol. III. 371, 372, 377
Speculation	Vol. I. 19
Suffolk system	Vol. I. 15, 16, 19, 22, 193, 341
U. S. Treasury system
Vol. I. 326, 330.	Vol. III. 350, 353, 383
Webster and the treasury system	Vol. III. 352
Will get into politics	Vol. I. 335
Would create money monopoly	Vol. I. 336

	PAGE
Would not work in the United States.....	Vol. I. 337
CENTRALIZATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT....	Vol. II. 250, 267, 278
CHICAGO	Vol. III. 5, 8, 18, 324, 325, 354
CLOSED SHOP (see Labor).	
COLORADO TRIPLE PROJECT	Vol. II. 257
COMMISSION GOVERNMENT Vol. I. 461. Vol. II. 335. Vol. III. 1	
Affirmative	Vol. I. 461. Vol. III. 1, 7, 13
Negative	Vol. I. 465, 471. Vol. III. 19, 25, 31
Commission Government	
Analogy with federal government	Vol. III. 2, 4
and checks and balances	Vol. I. 473. Vol. III. 23
and civic duty	Vol. III. 21
and Initiative and Referendum	Vol. I. 474
and recall	Vol. III. 12
and social conditions	Vol. III. 31
and ward system	Vol. III. 8, 9
Bibliography	Vol. I. 476. Vol. III. 38
Business government under.....	Vol. III. 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 22
Centralization of power under	Vol. III. 22
City a corporation (see Business Government)..	Vol. I. 464
Definition of	Vol. III. 1
Democracy of	Vol. I. 467, 472. Vol. III. 16
Efficiency of, in administration	Vol. III. 9, 25, 29
—in legislation	Vol. III. 28
Evils of present system	Vol. I. 463
Experience in Cedar Rapids	Vol. III. 14, 16
of Des Moines	Vol. I. 468. Vol. III. 10, 14
of Galveston	Vol. I. 461. Vol. III. 10
of Haverhill, Mass.	Vol. III. 14
of Houston, Tex.	Vol. I. 462. Vol. III. 14
Experience of Chicago under present system	Vol. III. 5, 8, 18
Fusion and separation of functions of government.....	Vol. III. 28, 30, 32, 36
Gets efficient men for office	Vol. I. 464
Graft	Vol. I. 475. Vol. III. 4-5, 14, 24, 30
Historical sketch of	Vol. I. 466
Indiana plan of municipal government.....	Vol. III. 33
Party politics under	Vol. III. 7, 26, 27
Public utilities under	Vol. III. 15
Responsibility under	Vol. I. 475. Vol. III. 4, 11
versus Mayor and council system	Vol. I. 467
COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE	Vol. VI. 317
Affirmative	319, 332, 343, 346
Negative	350, 358, 363, 371

	PAGE
Bibliography	374
Adequacy of	335, 358
Arbitration	320
Benefit to the men trained	338
Breeds distrust	352
Commercial war	339
Comparison of systems	366
Condition of navy	330, 363, 367, 372
Cost of	336-7, 348, 354, 370-71
Danger of war	322
Defense of Panama Canal	327
Definition	321
Economic superiority of	345
Effectiveness of	360
European strength after the war	331
Foreign population	326
Friendship of nations	353
Gospel of hatred	351-52
Hawaii a danger	323
Historical sketch	321
Industrial education while under arms	340, 370
Initiation of the question	319
Inquisitorial features	354
Is just	345
Isolation of the United States	324
Japan menaces us	322-24
Militia	329
Monroe Doctrine	322
Number of men affected by	333
Number of men needed for defense	328-329
One year plan	348, 359, 369
Philippine Islands	323
Preparedness	325, 336, 351
Present army, size of	328-329
Present force sufficient	327
Principle of compulsion	346
Race supremacy	326
Reserve system	334-35, 363, 370-71
Result of volunteer system	331
Strength of treaties	320
Un-American	350
Volunteer system	331, 343, 351, 361, 371
War spirit	354
War staff plan	364, 369-70
World peace and	347, 352, 367

	PAGE
CONSERVATION	Vol. I. 443. Vol. II. 159, 186, 227, 235
Affirmative	Vol. II. 235
Negative	Vol. II. 253
Conservation Vol. II.	
Alaskan	261
and emigration and immigration	266
Bibliography	279
by federal government	236, 238, 242, 244, 248, 250, 256
by states	237, 254, 258, 263, 267, 277, 285
Colorado Triple Project	257
Definition	235
Franchise tax	264
National resources belong to all the people	236
Reclamation projects	243
Table of products	255
Water power	245
CORPORATIONS, FEDERAL CHARTER FOR (see also under Interstate Commerce)	Vol. IV. 191
Affirmative	191, 198, 205, 207, 210
Negative	213, 221, 228, 235, 238, 242
Artificiality of interstate commerce division	218
Centralization of industry	226
Comity and courtesy	195, 227
Compulsory federal incorporation	219
Definition of terms in question	191-2, 205, 214
Dual system of government under	208, 216, 218, 234, 236-7, 243-44
Evasion of	209, 211, 223, 227, 239, 244
Evils of corporations	192, 201, 223-25
Evils of state system	193-200, 203, 213
Foreign corporations	194-5
History of corporations	192, 199
Inadequate	222
Interholding of corporations	194, 201
Is all inclusive	205-6, 214, 235-36, 240, 243
Issue of debate	242
Legal decisions	198, 199, 223, 229, 251
Litigation under	206, 212
Manufacturing and commerce	224
Merits of federal incorporation	203-4
Merits of substitute plan	233-34
Negative point of view	213-14
Not necessary	230, 240
Overcapitalization	193, 201
Police power of states	206, 209-10
Prerogative of federal government	198, 206-7

	PAGE
Protection of the investor	204, 234
Provisions of federal incorporation act	202
Publicity	194, 201, 204, 233
Stock exchange, regulation of, a remedy.....	232
Substitute plan	230-31
—closing mails as substitute	233
Taxation of corporations	196, 204, 207, 210
Uniformity of law	195, 203, 234
CUBA (see Annexation).	
DEBATING. Vol. I. Introduction. Vol. II. Introduction and Appendixes. Vol. IV. Introduction and Appendixes.	
Audience, debating for the	Vol. I. xvii, xviii, xix
Bibliography of	Vol. II. 483. Vol. IV. 515
Briefs	Vol. I. vii
—careless methods in	Vol. I. viii
Card indexes	Vol. I. xi, xii. Vol. II. xiv
Choosing the team	Vol. II. xviii
Committed speeches	Vol. I. xiii. Vol. II. x
Contracts, constitutions and agreements.....	Vol. IV. 487
Conventional debate	Vol. IV. xvi
Decisions, prejudiced	Vol. I. xxiii, xxiv. Vol. II. xix
Delivery	Vol. I. xxii. Vol. II. xiii
Dual debate	Vol. IV. xxix-xxx, 423, 497, 499
Effectiveness	Vol. I. xvii, xviii
Extempore debate	Vol. IV. xii-xiii
Extempore speaking	Vol. II. xiii
Honesty in	Vol. II. xvii
Honor societies	Vol. II. xxiii
Improvement in debate	Vol. IV. xi-xii
Increase in number of debates	Vol. IV. viii
Innovations in	Vol. IV. xxv
Judges....	Vol. I. xxiii. Vol. II. xix. Vol. IV. xxvii-xxviii
Keeping records of	Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. xi
Leagues	Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. xxi, 751
Limitations upon student debaters and enterprises.....	Vol. IV. ix-x
Methods in	Vol. I. xii, xiii. Vol. II. ix
Minor strategies	Vol. IV. xxxiii
One-point debate	Vol. IV. xxi
Organizations	Vol. I. xxvi. Vol. II. 413. Vol. III. 389. Vol. IV. 417
Point of view	Vol. II. xvi
Progress of	Vol. IV. vii
Questions—Vol. I. viii, 499. Vol. II. xx. Vol. II. 413, 431	
—choice of	Vol. I. ix, x

	PAGE
—uneven	Vol. I. xxiii, xxiv
Rebuttal	Vol. I. xx. Vol. II. x
Record of	Vol. IV. 425
References for debaters	Vol. IV. 515
References for debates	Vol. IV. 49, 141, 187, 245, 296, 373, 411
Some faults in	Vol. I. xiv, xv. Vol. II. x, xi, xii, xiii
Squad system	Vol. IV. xi
Status of	Vol. I. xxi
Strategy of	Vol. IV. xiv
Subjects	Vol. IV. xxx, xxxi
Suggested changes in procedure. Vol. I. xxi, xxii. Vol. II. viii	Vol. IV. xvi-xvii
Surprise debate	Vol. IV. xvii
Systems of debate	Vol. IV. xv
Table of results	Vol. IV. 485-86
Tendencies of	Vol. IV. xxviii
Triangulars	Vol. I. xxvii. Vol. II. 413
Year Book of 1912-13	Vol. IV. 415
DIRECT PRIMARIES	Vol. III. 43
Affirmative	Vol. III. 43, 52, 61, 71
Negative	Vol. III. 70
Direct Primaries	
and conventions	46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 71
and corruption	48
and delegate system	45
and judiciary	75
and the machine	53
and strength of party	54
and the vote	65
Bibliography	76
Bossism	47, 53, 58, 67
Crawford, Senator, on	62
Defects of	54, 63, 72, 73
Definition of	44
Education in government	64, 66
Gets the best candidates	59, 60
Gives control to the people	55, 57, 59, 60
Gore, Senator, on	62
Hughes, Justice, on	58
In the city	68, 73
Merriam, C. E., on	57, 69
Nomination system better	56, 57, 58, 72
Party caucus	48
People demand it	61
Primary laws in force (States)	42, 64, 74
Roosevelt on	62

	PAGE
Van Sant on (Ex. Gov. Minn.)	59
ENGLAND . Vol. I. 22, 23, 115, 116, 332, 339, 340, 421. Vol. II. 77, 98, 100, 112, 116. Vol. III. 128, 148, 158, 169, 172.	
EXPRESS BUSINESS, FEDERAL CONTROL OF	Vol. V. 57
Affirmative 57, 64, 68, 74, 77, 80, 91, 100, 109, 113, 116	
Negative 123, 129, 135, 139, 142, 144	
Accounting expense	60, 66, 88, 131
An American institution	57
Bibliography	147
Brokerage division	143
Cheaper service in	64-66, 133
Civil service in (with federal control)	72, 105
Competition in	60, 68, 89, 97, 114, 121, 129, 142
Cost of ownership to government	68, 108, 144
Economics of	58-59, 60, 98
Efficiency of	61, 75, 78, 82-3, 100, 127
Experience in government parcel carrying	
—Austria-Hungary	103
—Belgium	102
—Germany	101
—Russia	102
—Switzerland	102
Faults of	112, 123
Government ownership of	57-8, 79, 80, 85-6, 111, 141
—Demand for	113, 114
—Economic	86
—Efficiency of	64, 65, 66, 120, 125
—Politics in	71-72
—Practicability of	71, 77, 108, 113
—Success of	101-104
Government regulation of	
62, 63, 76, 78, 92-3, 97, 110, 114, 123, 141	
Hepburn act and	63
Lobbying of	95
Mercantile division	94
Monopoly	91, 98
Nature of	58
Parcel post	67, 75, 81, 83, 87, 89, 107
—weight limit of	84-5, 117, 124, 139
Postal system	74, 82, 119
Private ownership of	127
Railroad contracts	66, 69, 145
—Parcel post unfair to railroads	120, 132
Rates	75, 76, 92, 97, 139
—Unjust	59, 60, 61, 109
Rural service	62, 89, 99, 114

	PAGE
Service of (large and small package)	115, 133, 136, 145
—Extent of	62, 64, 65
—Under Postal system	126, 130, 133, 136, 140-141
Taxation of	96
United States Express Co.	76, 100, 123
Wages to employees	69
Watered stock	92
 FEDERAL CHARTER (see Corporations and Interstate Commerce).	
FRANCE	Vol. I. 423. Vol. III. 356, 372
FREE TRADE	Vol. II. 168, 178
 GERMANY	Vol. I. 332, 339, 340. Vol. III. 356, 372
GOVERNMENT (see Cabinet Officers in Congress)	Vol. I. 435. Vol. III. 241
Education in..Vol. I 76. Vol. II. 340, 359. Vol. III. 64, 66	
Government Ownership of Coal Mines.....Vol. I. 435	
Affirmative	435, 438, 441, 444, 446
Negative	448, 449, 451, 453
Abuses of coal trust	440-1
and conservation	443
and control by commission (Canadian plan)	450-2
and individual initiative	451
and leasing system	442, 456
and national debt	444
Bibliography	457
Cost of buying mines	444, 448
Price of coal	440, 452
Railroad and coal mine owner	455
Regulation, state	438
—federal	439, 447
Socialistic	446
Trust proposition	435, 436
—Northern Securities case	437
—Sherman anti-trust law	437
Waste in mining	439, 449
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS. Vol. VI. 383	
Affirmative	383, 389, 396, 403, 406, 410
Negative	415, 421, 427, 435, 437, 441
Abuses in present system	384
Affirmative plan for	393, 406, 438-39
Bond issue	392
Bureau of railroad economics	437
Canadian experience	426
Capitalization	388, 415, 435

	PAGE
Civil service	392, 393, 422-23
Comparison with Germany	390, 416, 418-19
Competition	401-02, 431, 432
Consolidation and monopoly	402-03, 412, 431
Democracy and government ownership	417
Discrimination	420-21, 429, 444
Efficient labor	407
Efficiency of service	400, 412, 417
Experience of our government with railroads	409
Experience of other governments	426, 445
Example of Panama Canal	393
Example of the Post Office department	393
Failure of government ownership	403-04
Federal incorporation	404-05, 411, 432
Government ownership undesirable	421
Gradual assumption of ownership	391
Improvement and extension	417-18, 423
Knapp plan	392, 406, 438-39
Labor	407, 422
Limitation of regulation	400
Necessity of government ownership	414
Political corruption and influence	385, 395, 406, 421, 440, 443
Pooling	412, 430, 432
Profit	398
Railroad districts	392
Railroads fight regulation	399
Rates	387, 396, 411, 417-18, 419-20, 433, 436
Regulation	399, 413, 428, 433, 440-42
Stock manipulation	386, 395, 410, 443
Transportation a public service	398
United States railroad system	383
Wages and rates	396, 427
Would increase operating expenses	424
Government Ownership of railroads	Vol. IV. 257
Affirmative	257, 267, 278, 280
Negative	286, 287
Better service under	269, 295
Bibliography	296
Circuitous routing	270
Comparison of railways in Europe and U. S.	271, 279, 292
Competition in railroad affairs	265
Cost of government ownership	267-8, 285, 286
Cost of government operation	268, 289
Discrimination in rates under private ownership, 265, 282, 294	
Efficiency of railroad employees	283
Efficiency of service (see Better Service).	

	PAGE
Eight hour day under government ownership	289
European experience	271
—in Switzerland	274
—in Italy	273
—in Prussia	272
Evils of private ownership	259-60, 282
Historical sketch of subject	257-58
Individual initiative	283, 287
Influence on business	261
Interstate commerce commission	294
Issue of debate	259, 281, 285, 287
Loss of life	260, 295
New Zealand railroads	273
Panama canal	276
Panama railway	277
Puts railroads in politics	284, 286, 288
Postal system	275, 290
Public men against	280-81, 293
Rates	261
—Discriminations in	262-3, 265, 282, 294
—Uniform	280
Reduplication of lines	264
Upkeep and improvement	290-91
versus regulation	293
Would increase employees and expense for labor	289
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF THE MERCHANT MARINE Vol. VI. 203	
Affirmative	203, 211, 217, 221
Negative	225, 234
Bibliography	242
Admeasurement laws	230
Auxiliaries	208, 228
Benefits of	212
Cost	219, 238
Dangerous to United States	232-33
Demand for	222, 232
Discrimination	220
Evils in shipping	212-13
Expediency of	232
Failure of private capital	204, 214, 229
Foreign competition	241
Government as a commercial executive	216
is public function	206, 235
is public duty	208
Issues involved	203, 219, 225-26
Method of obtaining ships	222, 231, 237
Navigation laws	223, 230, 242

	PAGE
Need of	223, 227, 232
Operation	222, 236
Opposition of ship owners	209-10
Practicable	215, 235
Precedent for	222, 226, 235
Profit or loss	215, 229, 240
Standard of seamen's living	224
Subsidy	205
United States line to Panama	213
War emergency	229
GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE.....	
	Vol. VI. 3
Affirmative	3, 10, 15, 24, 27, 31
Negative	37, 42, 49, 56, 59, 63
Bibliography	67
Comparison with	
Australia	65
Canada	53
England	9, 53
France	50, 58
Germany	50
Countries having government ownership of telegraph and telephone	18
Delay in government ownership	46
Demand for	34
Efficient personnel in government ownership	26-27, 30, 46
Efficiency of government owned systems	44, 45, 49, 53
Efficiency of private service	64
Evils of present system	4, 33, 48
Experience of U. S. in government ownership of tele- phone	20-2, 54
Extent of system in U. S.	16, 26, 41, 57, 60
Extent, as compared with Europe	26, 27, 28, 29, 40, 44, 50
Extension and improvement	9, 11, 25, 30, 31-32, 43
Failure of government ownership of telephone, etc.	50
Financial failure of government ownership of tele- phone	24, 34, 44
Government's policy service	12, 13, 43
History government ownership of telephone and tele- graph	3, 20-21
Issues	4, 37
Labor	63-64
Necessary	5, 38
Public Utility monopoly	11
Physical valuation	8
Per cent. of messages per capita	9

	PAGE
Postal function	10, 14-15, 33
Post office and telephone and telegraph	57, 58, 63
Paternalistic	30
Political influence of	25, 29, 47, 59
Private ownership and continuous policy	43
Private business incentive	42-43
Relationship of telegraph and telephone	16-17
Rates	5-8, 18, 24, 39, 56-57, 61
Rates of European countries, comparison with.....	18-19, 24, 56-57, 61
Rates for press service	8
Rates and service	19, 29, 39
Regulation	28, 55
Watered stock	7, 32, 62
Municipal Government (see Commission Government).	
Parliamentary vs. Presidential Government	Vol. I. 367. Vol. III. 241
Affirmative	Vol. I. 367, 368. Vol. III. 241, 248, 256, 264, 266, 271
Negative	Vol. I. 369, 370, 372. Vol. III. 274, 283, 291, 298, 301, 305
Parliamentary Government	
and issues	Vol. III. 294
and judiciary	Vol. III. 289
and the minority	Vol. III. 265, 293
and principles	Vol. III. 294
and the recall	Vol. III. 259
and suffrage	Vol. III. 265, 267
Bibliography	Vol. I. 372. Vol. III. 308
Can be more quickly adjusted to a crisis	Vol. I. 371
Checks and balances	Vol. I. 368. Vol. III. 255, 267, 275, 280, 281
Definition	Vol. I. 369. Vol. III. 241, 242, 274
Distinguished from Presidential	Vol. III. 243, 257, 275
Efficiency of	Vol. III. 256, 260, 283
Elasticity of	Vol. I. 370
Enables the people to fix responsibility	Vol. I. 371
Fractional legislation	Vol. III. 288, 301, 304
Fusion and diffusion of elements of government	Vol. III. 257, 268, 272, 286, 287, 291, 292
Harmony of action	Vol. III. 260
Hasty legislation	Vol. III. 286, 302, 303
Ministry system	Vol. III. 245, 246, 257
More efficient	Vol. I. 372
Political parties and the ministry	Vol. III. 245-6, 258-9, 266, 269, 278, 284, 288, 300

	PAGE
Responsive to the will of the people	Vol. III. 246, 249, 253, 268, 270, 296
Responsibility is fixed	Vol. III. 251
Stability of	Vol. III. 245, 264
Tenure of office	Vol. III. 250, 268, 285
Presidential form	
and compromise	Vol. III. 269
and democracy	Vol. III. 292
Checks and balances	Vol. III. 255, 267, 275, 280, 281
Committee legislation system	Vol. III. 252, 301
Defense of presidential form	Vol. I. 367
Fixed term under	Vol. III. 250, 268, 285
Party system under	Vol. III. 258
Stability of	Vol. III. 277, 279, 299, 305
GUARANTEE OF BANK DEPOSITS	Vol. I. 305
Affirmative	305, 309
Negative	312
Guarantee of Bank Deposits	
Advantages of	309
and panics	309, 319
Banks are public service corporations	306
Bibliography	321
Experience, of New York	316
—of Michigan	317
—of Virginia	317
—of Oklahoma	318
Historical sketch of	305
Increases deposits	310
Oklahoma law, constitutionality of	319
Plan for	311
Socialistic	320
Theory of deposits	307
Theory of guarantee	307
versus good management	314, 315
Wild cat banking	311
Wrong in principle	313
IMMIGRATION	Vol. I. 165
as a labor factor	Vol. III. 112, 141, 161, 193, 235
Affirmative	Vol. I. 165, 170, 174
Negative	Vol. I. 177, 181, 183
Immigration. Vol. I.	
Bibliography	186
Congregate in slums	171, 180
Demand for labor	177, 178
Depresses wages	170

	PAGE
Distribution of	171
Educational test	167, 169, 173, 178-9, 181
—Advocates of	176
—Plan for	174
Illiteracy	178-9
Inspection plan	184
Physical test	185
Report, Labor commission	182-3
—Senate commission	176
Restriction, history of	165, 166
—need of	166, 168, 184
—political reason for	167
—social and economic need of	168
Undesirables	172, 180
IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTION OF BY LITERACY TEST. Vol. V.	155
Affirmative	155, 163, 172, 181
Negative	186, 193, 205, 212
Ability to speak English	168, 195
Assimilability	162, 165, 171, 182, 194, 214
Basis for	158
Bibliography	216
California immigration	157
Congestion in cities	196, 197
Consular inspection and four per cent. stock plan	163, 178-79, 181, 187, 211, 212-15
Danger of literacy	202
Deportation	176
Discrimination of	192
Distribution of immigrants	200
Education of immigrants in old country	173, 205, 206
Efficient plan	160
Evasion of	178
Historical sketch of	155
Industrial stratification	166
Inexpensive plan	177
Immigration commission	156, 186
Justice of	172, 191, 207-208
Naturalization question	168
Need for farm labor	164
New and old immigration	190, 195, 199, 203
Number it would exclude	161
Padrone system	170
Permanent exclusion	175
Permanency of immigration	201-2, 204, 211
Practicability of	177
Public opinion favors it	158-9

	PAGE
Qualitative restriction	162, 165, 213
Quantitative restriction	160, 163, 189, 208-10, 212
Qualifications for literacy test	157-8
Recommended by Immigration Commission.....	156, 178, 186
Southern and Eastern Europe	161, 166
Statistics on European education systems.....	173
Statistics on literacy test and four per cent. stock plans.	199
Unskilled labor.....	208
Unintelligence	209
Wages by nationality	167, 194, 213
INCOME TAX	Vol. I. 93. Vol. II. 1
Affirmative..Vol. I. 94. Vol. II. 1, 12, 17, 20, 22, 59, 64, 71	78, 81, 85
Negative....Vol. I. 99. Vol. II. 24, 32, 40, 46, 48, 51, 89, 94	102, III, 114
As a war tax	Vol. II. 28, 29, 47
Best tax for business	Vol. I. 96, 98, 103
Bibliography	Vol. I. 107. Vol. II. 52, 121
Catches professional leisure class	Vol. I. 97
Civil war tax	Vol. I. 93, 102. Vol. II. 9, 37, 83, 108
Class legislation	Vol. I. 103, 104. Vol. II. 43
Collection of (see Stoppage at Source and Self-assessment)	Vol. II. 34, 35, 75, 85, 117
Constitutionality of	Vol. I. 93, 94, 106. Vol. II. 2
Countries having it	Vol. II. 59, 73
Direct tax	Vol. I. 100. Vol. II. 4, 27, 28, 49
Double taxation	Vol. II. 79
Drives away capital	Vol. I. 103. Vol. II. 73
Emergency measure	Vol. II. 21, 61, 79
Encourages governmental extravagance ..	Vol. II. 40, 42, 92
English experience	Vol. II. 77, 98, 100, 112, 116
Evasion of	Vol. I. 100, 101. Vol. II. 67, 71, 84, 85
Financial necessity	Vol. II. 7, 30, 46, 60, 78, 89, 95, 104
Gladstone on	Vol. I. 101
Graduated	Vol. II. 57
—Plan for	Vol. II. 66, 77, 85, 97, 98, 106, 119
Impracticability of	Vol. II. 21, 23, 81, 96, 102, 116
Inquisitorial features of	Vol. I. 100. Vol. II. 38, 39
Justice of, Vol. 95, 98. Vol. II. 62, 72, 95, 104, 107, 110, 118	
Popularity of	Vol. I. 100
President Taft on	Vol. II. 5
Prussian tax	Vol. II. 119
Self-assessment or personal declaration...Vol. II. 35, 47, 101	
Shifting of burden or incidence	Vol. II. 120
Stoppage of, at source	Vol. II. 8, 22, 47
Supreme Court decision	Vol. I. 93, 94, 106

	PAGE	
Undemocratic	Vol. I. 104, 105, 106.	Vol. II. 79
INDEPENDENCE FOR THE PHILIPPINES. Vol. V.		223
Affirmative	223, 228, 238,	247
Negative	249, 257, 264,	272
Bibliography		275
Capital in Islands		227, 268
Commercialism		227
Danger of Islands to U. S.		250
Desire of Filipinos		224
Education in Islands	230, 231, 232, 234,	244, 267
English language in Islands		236
Filipinos in the government		231, 262
Filipinos' ability to govern		240
Filipinos lack initiative		251
Filipinos not ready for		228
Finances of Islands	238-39, 266,	270
Fraud in elections		263
Freedom our governmental principle.....		225
Homogeneity of Filipinos		229, 246
Improvements in Islands		230, 262
Incapable of self-government	246, 247, 253,	258-269
Industrial training in Islands		232
Japan and Islands		242
Literacy in Islands	235, 248, 254,	265, 272
Methods of granting		241
Middle class in Islands		245, 260
Morality in Islands		233, 234
Need of railroads in		268
Neutrality treaty		241-42, 265
Politics in the Islands		259
Public works in Islands		230, 231, 262
Religion in the Islands		230
Sanitation in the Islands		233
Spanish rule of Philippines		234
Taxation in the Islands		267
U. S. intention concerning		223
Voting population in Islands		254
When shall U. S. grant		225
INITIATIVE		Vol. III. 25, 31
INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM		Vol. II. 283, Vol. III. 12, 297
Vol. I. 67.	Vol. II. 283.	Vol. III. 12, 297
Affirmative	Vol. I. 67, 70, 75.	Vol. II. 283, 288, 292
Negative	Vol. I. 78, 81, 85.	Vol. II. 296, 302, 307
Initiative and Referendum		88
Amendment in considering legislation not provided. Vol. I.		88
and bribery		Vol. II. 289, 298

	PAGE
and the constitution	Vol. II. 301, 307
and the courts	Vol. II. 310
and the legislature	Vol. II. 297
and popular will	Vol. II. 291, 305
and the short ballot	Vol. II. 299
Bibliography	Vol. I. 89. Vol. II. 313
Conditions do not demand it	Vol. I. 80
Conflicting interests demand supplement to legislative system	Vol. I. 71
Dangerous to the equilibrium of the three departments of government	Vol. I. 85
Definition	Vol. I. 67, 79, Vol. II. 283
Democracy of	Vol. I. 70. Vol. II. 284, 289
Destructive of representative government.....	Vol. II. 311
Diffuses responsibility	Vol. I. 83
Does not meet needs	Vol. I. 81, 82
Education in government	Vol. I. 76
Emergency laws under	Vol. I. 73, 84
Encourages class legislation	Vol. I. 87
Multiplicity of careless legislation under	Vol. I. 75
Obliterates distinction between constitutional and statute law	Vol. I. 86
Optional referendum	Vol. I. 72
Oregon experience	Vol. I. 77, 81. Vol. II. 293
Plan for	Vol. I. 72, 75
Public opinion ignored in present system....	Vol. I. 71, 82
Reasons for in New York	Vol. II. 293
Reasons against in New York	Vol. II. 297, 305
Simplifies elective system	Vol. I. 77
Too radical	Vol. II. 298
Weakens legislature	Vol. I. 82
Weakness in the representative system.....	Vol. I. 69, 71
INJUNCTION AND FEDERAL COURTS—LABOR DISPUTES	Vol. I. 129
Affirmative	129, 130, 131
Negative	132, 134, 135
Injunction	
Abuse of	133
Accelerates justice	131-2
Bibliography	137
Boycott	129, 133, 134
Bucks Stove case	132
Chief Justice Shepherd on	135
Danger of	136
Primary boycott and strike	134
Roosevelt on	133
Taft on	134

	PAGE
Usurpation of power under	135-6
Writ of	130
INJUNCTIONS IN LABOR DISPUTES	Vol. V. 333
Affirmative	333, 340, 346, 352, 356, 359
Negative	363, 370, 376, 382, 384
Abuse of	337, 341, 347, 357, 359, 374, 377, 378, 385, 388
and industrial struggle	345
Arbitration	376
Bibliography	392
Blacklist and lockout	350, 368-69, 372, 383
Boycott and	359-60
Bucks Stove and Range Co. case	364
Cause of	364-5
Courts of equity and courts of law	335, 355, 371
Dayton case—United Mine Workers	342
Debs case	338
Definitions	334
Delay of mails	348, 356, 365, 370, 380
Discretion of judges	378, 385
Enjoining strikes	341
Erdman Act	348
Freedom of the press	366, 371
Historical sketch	333
Interstate commerce and	348, 356, 367, 380
Jenkins case and the strike	341
Judicial interpretation	337, 386
Labor and	368
Limitation of, would work	347
Limitation of, and capital	379
Non-union man and	357, 379
Number of	252, 373
Picketing and	386
Property vs. human right	349, 360, 373
Simplification of court procedure	336
Society and	361, 365-368, 371, 380
Strike breaking and	342-344
Summary of affirmative	361-62
Summary of negative	390
Swiftness of application	338
INSURANCE, INDUSTRIAL	Vol. IV. 301
Accident insurance	Vol. IV. 305
Affirmative	305, 313, 321, 328, 332, 335
Negative	338, 340, 353, 362, 365, 369
Arbitration	309, 314
Bibliography	373

	PAGE
Comparison of U. S. and German accident insurance laws	312, 318, 339, 346
Compensation statistics	323, 333, 359
Compulsory insurance	309, 315, 324, 329, 332, 336, 355-57, 366
Cost of accident insurance	363
Countries having compulsory insurance	317, 366
Drain on industry	358
Efficiency of workmen	311-12, 349, 363
Employers liability laws	306
Fails to bring about friendly relations	342
Fixed scale of compensation	308, 313
Frees employee from anxiety	311-12
French experience	327
German accident insurance law	306
—Principles of	307
How German act works	310, 330, 341
Individual and the trade	325
Is desirable	322, 326, 355
Justice of accident insurance	325
Liability litigation	306, 314, 344
Majority of insurance borne by employers	308, 314, 325
Mutual associations	307, 309, 317, 324, 350, 354, 357, 367, 370
Mutual vs. old line insurance	319, 364
Old age insurance	348-49
Optional insurance	333, 335-36, 360, 365
Pauperism under	342, 349
Prevention of accidents under	311-12, 327, 343
Railroad accidents	305
Simulation under	331, 344
Statistics of German act	311, 326, 363
Uniformity	316
Wage statistics	322-23
Wisconsin law	335
 OLD AGE INSURANCE	 Vol. IV. 348-49 377
Affirmative	379, 387
Negative	395, 402
and child labor	386
Bibliography	411
Comparison of present plan and old age insurance	383, 397
Complex in administration	399, 406
Compulsion of	384, 391
Conditions in U. S. against	397-99
English experience with	390, 392-3
European experience	398
French experience with	373

	PAGE
German experience with	392, 403-4
Government pension plan	389
Old age poverty	380, 385, 387, 402, 405
Pension by private corporation plan	388
Political danger of	410
Poverty and pauperism under	396, 403
Present system of charity	381
Socialism under	409
Voluntary insurance	390
Working of old age insurance	381
INTERSTATE COMMERCE CORPORATIONS, FEDERAL CHARTER FOR (see also under Corporations)	Vol. I. 39
Affirmative	39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46
Negative	47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54
Federal Charter	
and taxation	52
Bibliography	55
Centralization of power under	43, 47, 48
Constitutionality of	46, 52
Diversity of laws	41
Double control	42, 43
Federal and state friction	42
Monopoly	49
Overcapitalization	49
Present system fails	40
—Evils of	40, 41, 42, 43
Publicity, effect of	49, 50
Radical departure	47
Recapitalization, difficulties of	47
State incorporation	40
State rights	46, 52, 53
JUDGES (see Appointment and Recall)	Vol. I. 345. Vol. III. 75, 289
JUDICIAL DECISIONS; RECALL OF. (See under Recall)	
JURY DECISION BY THREE FOURTHS OF THE MEMBERS. Vol. III. 313	
Affirmative	313, 314, 315
Negative	317, 323, 330
Bibliography	337
Contrast between American and English systems	326-7-8
Decision in civil suits	318
Delay in procedure of court	327, 332
Effect of skilled counsel on jury	334
Hung juries	320
Impaneling the jury, method of	325-6, 332
Needless appeals	328

	PAGE
Police system	324
Proficiency of jurymen	333
Unanimity and crime	322, 332
Unanimity safer	321
 LABOR UNION	Vol. I. 201. Vol. III. 103
Are labor unions beneficial	Vol. I. 201
Affirmative	201, 205, 208
Negative	211, 213, 215
Advantages of capital	202
Bargaining power of	202-3
Bibliography	219
Boycott	215
Causes false equality in labor	212
Causes inferior product	216
Closed shop	214
Coercion	213
Definition	201
Eight hour day	204, 205, 207, 216
Engenders class spirit	212
Historical sketch of labor	202
Incorporation of labor unions	213
Labor union principles	Vol. III. 188
Lawlessness	217
Limitation of apprentices	212
Limitation of products	216
Opposed to machinery	213
Picketing	215
Places laborers on the same plane	212
Report of U. S. Industrial Commission	206, 207, 210
Restriction of skilled workmen	213
Social significance of	208, 209, 217
Strikes	214, 215
—sympathetic	215
Violence	215
Wages	203, 204, 205, 206, 217, 218, 219
Workingmen's insurance	207, 208, 209
Closed shop vs. open shop	Vol. I. 261. Vol. III. 185
Affirmative	Vol. I. 261, 268, 274, 282, 285, 288
.....	Vol. III. 187, 193, 200
Negative	Vol. I. 264, 270, 276, 280, 283, 286
.....	Vol. III. 206, 213, 219
Closed shop	
and compulsory membership	Vol. I. 278. Vol. III. 215-16
and efficiency	Vol. III. 196, 202
and industrial peace	Vol. III. 204

	PAGE
and standard of living	Vol. I. 270. Vol. III. 189-90
and unemployment	Vol. III. 214-15
Apprentices, limitation of	Vol. I. 283. Vol. III. 212
Benefit to consumers	Vol. III. 205
Benefit to employer	Vol. I. 275. Vol. III. 201, 202, 203-4
Benefit to the workingman	Vol. III. 198
Bibliography	Vol. I. 290. Vol. III. 226
Coal strike commission award	Vol. I. 264
Collective bargaining	Vol. I. 272. Vol. III. 201, 202-3-4
Conditions contrasted in open and closed shops	Vol. III. 203
Definition	Vol. III. 187
Dictation to employer	Vol. I. 265, 273. Vol. III. 222
Employers' associations	Vol. I. 287. Vol. III. 191
Evils of	Vol. I. 265-6, 281
Exclusion	Vol. I. 278, 285. Vol. III. 211
Immigrant labor	Vol. III. 193
Individual right of contract	Vol. I. 282. Vol. III. 196, 218
Injustice to the public	Vol. III. 224
Is fair	Vol. III. 201
Legality of	Vol. I. 274, 282. Vol. III. 221
Membership of union, restriction of	Vol. I. 264, 268, 270, 274 279. Vol. III. 212, 217
Monopoly of labor	Vol. I. 279. Vol. II. 250. Vol. III. 208
Necessity of	Vol. I. 262, 272, 275. Vol. III. 188, 190
Non-union man, competition of	Vol. I. 271 —his wages
	Vol. III. 192
	—per cent. foreign
Open union and closed shop	Vol. III. 216-7
Output, restriction of	Vol. I. 267, 276-7. Vol. III. 210
Percentage of union labor unskilled	Vol. III. 94
Violence under	Vol. I. 261, 266-7, 280, 284. Vol. III. 209-10
Wages under	Vol. I. 269, 274, 275
 MINIMUM WAGE	 Vol. III. 83. Vol. VI. 71 (See below).
Affirmative	83, 93, 107, 116, 124, 135, 138, 142
Negative	147, 156, 164, 174, 77, 179
 Minimum wage	
and child labor	86
and economy of production	120-1
and equality of opportunity	513
and morality	111-12, 114, 143
and price of product	101, 154, 176
and unemployed	153
Australian plan of	91, 120, 142, 164
Benefits to the employer	99
Bibliography	183

	PAGE
Charts on	132
Constitutionality of	145, 168, 171, 180
Definition	83, 108
Driving out industries	155, 160
Economic and labor authorities favoring	92-3
Elasticity of	140, 157
English plan	128, 148, 158
Government prerogative	102, 122, 166
Immigration under	141, 145, 166
Intimidates capital	155, 160
Law of supply and demand	90
Mobility of labor	143
Necessity of	136, 150
Opinions on	128, 131, 152, 159, 169, 170-1, 178
Parasitism	109
Plans of	94-5, 119, 126
Practicability of	137
Protects laborer	92
States proposing laws	96
Sweat shop	84, 148
—and disease	86, 100
—and organized labor	89
—and present law	90, 91
—and wages	85, 88, 89, 97
Wage boards	95, 97, 120, 126
Wages and standard of living 97, 125, 135, 150, 156, 159, 174-5	
Wage, the living	108, 117, 118, 125
—Maximum and minimum	98, 128, 142, 153
—Theory of	115, 117, 163
MINIMUM WAGE	Vol. VI. 71
Affirmative	73, 82, 90
Negative	99, 107, 117, 129, 133, 137, 143, 147, 149
Bibliography	153
Apprentices	92
Basis of wages	77, 80, 108, 111
Better remedy	123
Child labor	88, 147
Collective bargaining	78, 142
Comparative conditions in Australia and the U. S.	95, 96
Definition	73, 74
Degeneracy	88-89, 143
Dependent workers	88
Diminishing returns	138
Drastic	101
Effect on migration to cities	113
Employers and	84, 140-41

	PAGE
Enforcing minimum wage	94, 144
Factory legislation	75
Freedom of contract	116
History of minimum wage	75, 109, 131
Human subsidy	85, 157
Increases immigration	114, 134, 147
Inelastic	105, 112
Labor is opposed	106
Living wage	79, 80, 112, 130, 150
Living wage, service and efficiency	84, 93, 114, 130, 133
Minimum will become maximum	92, 115
Normal worker	183
Parasitism	85, 87
Paternalistic	117, 131, 143
Poverty	104
Production of labor	135
Public and	86
Skilled labor	82
Social problems	88
Strikes and	115
Subnormal labor	88, 91
Sweated industry	79
Unskilled labor	84, 103
Wages	108
Wages in the U. S.	80, 100
Wages and efficiency	83, 133, 134, 135
Would throw laborers out of employment	110, 130, 131, 138, 146
 MONROE DOCTRINE, ABANDONMENT OF. Vol. V	3
Affirmative	3, 10, 16, 20
Negative	22, 32, 41, 46
A. B. C. powers and	9, 42-3
Advantages of	27
Altruistic	19
Attitude of public	26, 36, 37
Bibliography	50
Bingham's book on	23
Caribbean powers and	13
Cause of ill will toward U. S.	44
Changes in	5, 6, 7, 11, 46-47
Colombia and	14
Conditions in 1823	4, 16
Danger to the U. S.	33
Debt collecting	6, 48-49
Definitions	3, 22, 43, 47
Drago Doctrine	39, 40

	PAGE
Embarrassment of in Benton affair	II
Europe's attitude 4, 8, 17, 20, 24, 29, 30, 33, 35, 38, 40,	49
Holy Alliance and	4, 8
International law and	17, 26, 33, 47
Interests of U. S.	15, 24, 27, 36
Latin America and	43-44
Lodge resolution	6, 8, 48
Magdalena Bay	7
Mexico and	7, 48
Need of	17, 22
Nicaragua and	6, 34, 35
No demand for abandonment	23, 26
Panama Canal and	28, 30, 33
Peace and	38, 39
Practicability of abandonment	29, 31
Present conditions and	5
Roosevelt on	24
Santo Domingo and	5, 48
South America and	9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 25, 28, 42, 45, 47
Taft on	24
Venezuela and	5, 12, 30, 40, 47, 48
 NATIONAL BANKS	Vol. III. 342, 344, 354, 357, 371, 375, 380
NAVY, AN INCREASED	Vol. I. 293
Affirmative	293, 294, 295
Negative	295, 296
Bibliography	297
Definition	293
Money needed for other things	297
Necessity of	294-5
Sufficient now	295-6
Weakness of the navy	294
Will make for peace	295
 NEW YORK	Vol. II. 325, 353, 377
NOMINATIONS (see Direct Primary).	
 OREGON	Vol. II. 293, 311, 334
 PANICS	Vol. I. 4, 18, 21, 33, 309, 310, 484, 492-3. Vol. II. 193
	Vol. III. 349, 353, 377
PARLIAMENTARY VS. PRESIDENTIAL (see Government).	
PHILIPPINES, INDEPENDENCE OF (see under Independence).	
POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS	Vol. I. 377
Affirmative	377, 379
Negative	381, 383, 384
Bibliography	386

	PAGE
Cost of campaign	383
Deadlocks	378, 380, 382
Direct election conservative	379
Direct election efficient	380
Direct primary as substitute	380
Evils of legislative choice	378, 381
Legislative election has failed	378
Remedy for present evils	385
Would change the character of the Senate	384
Would destroy checks and balances	384
Would increase corruption	383
POSTAL SAVINGS BANK	Vol. I. 481
Affirmative	481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486
Negative	487, 488, 490, 491, 492, 494
and panics	484, 492, 493
Bibliography	495
Centralizes investment power	489
Competition with present banks	483, 488
Encourages small depositors	482
Government could not invest funds	490
Government funds (including savings bank) not liable to attachment	489
Increases thrift	482, 491
Necessity for	481, 487
Will stop hoarding	482, 488
Would benefit only Wall Street	491, 492, 493
PRIMARIES (see Direct Primaries).	
PROTECTIVE TARIFF (see Tariff).	
PROPERTY TAX (see Tax).	
 RAILROADS (see under Government Ownership).	
RAILROAD DISCRIMINATION IN RATES	Vol. I. 49
RAILROADS, FEDERAL CONTROL OF	Vol. I. 147
Affirmative	147, 148
Negative	151, 155
Bibliography	159
Capitalization of railroads	148, 149, 153
Centralization of power	154
Federal license system	156
License vs. charter	157
Insures just taxation	148, 151
Interstate commerce commission	155
National problem	147, 150
Necessary for rate regulation	148, 154
Pooling	150, 153
Rebates	153

	PAGE
RAW MATERIAL, ADMISSION FREE	Vol. II. 185, 160
Affirmative	185, 196
Negative	207, 216, 227
and compensatory duties	201
and conservation	186, 227
and double protection	204
and labor	188, 205
and prices	203, 214, 221
and reciprocity	194
and shifting of import tax	189, 190
Bibliography	229
Cheapens manufactured products	189, 224
Definition of	185, 217
Increases foreign trade	193
Is an unjust discrimination	222
Means increased tariff on finished product	218, 219
Not a principle of the Democratic party	208
Other countries tax raw material	229
Theory of	187, 197
RECALL OF JUDGES	Vol. II. 366
Affirmative	369, 377, 383
Negative	389, 396, 401
RECALL, THE	
and caprice and popular clamor	385, 399, 403-4
and people and constitutional government	379, 399
and rights of the minority	400
Cannot trust people	380
Corruption of the judiciary	371, 391
Definition of	370, 389
Delay in courts	375, 393
Election under Recall confuses issues—puts enemies on the jury	398
English system	386
Evils of—Elective system	391
—Appeal system	393
—Antiquated procedure	393
—Remedy for	406
Experimental	388
Experience of California	387
Experience of Kentucky	404-5
Experience of Oregon	387, 394, 405
Forces judge into politics	402
History of	369
Independence of judges	397, 398, 403
Inefficient judiciary under	402
Inequality in justice	371, 373

	PAGE
Interpretation of the question	369-70, 390
Judicial legislation	374
Judicial oligarchy	374
Justice of the Recall	377, 396
Just to the people	379, 399
Just to the judge	377-78, 396, 397
Makes office unattractive	402
Massachusetts system	406
Nature of the Judiciary	390-7
Need of the Recall	371
Negative fallacies	377
Potential value of	385
Power in the hands of corrupt interests	393
Practicability of	383, 391
Protects the judge	378, 397-9
Rich and poor in litigation	371, 373
Rule of majority	380, 385, 399, 403
Sacredness of the judiciary	381, 396-7
Successful in practice	386, 394
Swiss system	387
Unfair trial for judge	397-8
Unsafe	402
Usurpation of courts	374, 384
Vindicates judge	378, 397
Would be overworked	382, 385
Would remedy evils	383, 391
RECALL JUDICIAL DECISIONS	Vol. IV. 61
Affirmative	61, 66, 71, 93, 102, 114
Negative	76, 81, 86, 117, 129
and bad legislation	136
and constitutional amendment	72, 82, 116, 129, 133
—examples against constitutional amendment	72
and federal supreme court decisions	79, 87, 88
and method of submitting question of recall	104-5, 114, 126
and public attitude and capability	82, 83, 103-5, 114-15, 121, 125, 127, 134
and social justice	67, 68
Attitude of courts	63
Bibliography	141
Check upon judiciary	94, 108
Checks and balances	135
Clark, Chief Justice Walter, on	71
Correct in principle	108
“due process of law” clause	61, 65
Expense of	79, 80, 101, 124
How it works	69, 78-9, 85, 119, 134

	PAGE
Incorrect in principle	127, 129, 130, 131
Independence of judiciary	75, 98, 110, 131
Individual vs. Society	61-62, 111
Is class legislation	118
Judicial legislation	69-70, 95
Lewis, Wm. Draper, on	70
Legal decisions referred to	
Adair vs. People, Ill.	96
Bake shop case	84, 98
Cases where recall would work	115
Dred Scott Decision	100, 110
Income tax case	102, 109
Ives vs. S. Buffalo Ry. Co.	72, 87, 99, 119, 138
Jacobs Tenement house case	85, 100
New York street car case	96
Oglesby case, Mo.	98
People vs. Lochner (see Bake shop case).	
Richie vs. Wayman, 244 Ill. 509	64
Richie vs. People, 155 Ill. 98	64
Sarah Kniseley's arm	112
Western Union Telegraph case, Kans.	102
Necessity of	63, 94, 95, 97, 137-38
—Examples showing necessity	63, 64, 68, 96, 97, 98
Period of deliberation	74
Police power	61, 62, 66, 112
Practicability	100, 125
People do not want it	134
Roosevelt, Theodore, on	93
Substitute for	87
Would scatter responsibility	130
RECALL OF OFFICIALS	Vol. III. 12, 259
REGULATION OF TRUSTS (see also Corporations)	Vol. IV. 151
Affirmative	151, 160, 165
Negative	171, 177, 182
Bibliography	187
Competition	153-4-5, 161, 175
Consumer and regulation	159, 169
Failure of dissolution	163, 166, 169
Federal incorporation	169
Historical sketch—Sherman law	151-2
Interstate commerce commission	167, 179, 182
Injunction under Sherman law	183
Legal Decisions referred to	
Addison Pipe and Steel Co. case	179, 180
Danbury Hatters' case	178
Northern Securities case	163, 180

	PAGE
Other cases	180
Tobacco case	163, 180
Trans-Missouri Traffic case	163, 179
Number of industrial cases	166
Negative analysis of question	171
Overcapitalization	169, 173
Publicity under the Sherman law	185-86
Principle of Sherman law	152, 153, 154-55, 159, 176
Small competitor	164
Standard Oil decision	163
State dissolution legislation	181
Sherman law, its clauses	177-78
Trust commission and present method	167-68
Trusts, number of	166
—Carnegie, Andrew, on	173
—Good and bad trusts	161-62
—Efficiency of	156, 160-61, 173-74
—Development of	154-55, 160, 172
—Legalization of	175
—Wilson, Woodrow, on	173, 175
REVENUE, INTERNAL	Vol. II. 17, 91, 112
Stability of	Vol. II. 111, 112
Tariff	Vol. II. 15, 18, 30, 62, 63, 71, 72, 86, 92, 113, 225
SENATORS, POPULAR ELECTION OF (see Popular Election)	Vol. III. 252
SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW (see under Regulation of Trusts)	
SHIP SUBSIDY	Vol. I. 405. Vol. VI. 247
Affirmative	405, 410, 413, 416, 417, 418
Negative	420, 424, 427
and free trade and protection	422, 427, 428
and free material	429
and revision of navigation laws	430, 431
and ship insurance	430
Bibliography	431
by discriminating duties	411, 416, 418
Definition	405, 406
English merchant marine	421
Expense of	418
Extent of American shipping	405, 406
Foreign ships carry American trade	405, 406, 407
—Evil of	407
Foreign subsidies	410, 421
France	423
Germany	423
Merchant marine a naval resource	407, 415

	PAGE
Merchant marine furnishes labor a new occupation.....	414
Merchant marine would train sailors for navy.....	408
Must protect shipbuilding industry	409
Navy lacks colliers and transports	408
Permanent or temporary subsidy	426
Plan for	411, 412
Produces inefficiency	425
Size of marine	406, 408
Subvention, cargo	414, 419
—mail	421, 422
Table—U. S. and Japan	412, 413
Will give independence from foreign shipping combinations	415
Will increase our foreign trade	415, 425
SHIP SUBSIDY	Vol. VI. 247
Affirmative	249, 256, 263, 270, 274, 278
Negative	280, 288, 295, 302, 306, 309
Bibliography	312
American enterprise	269-70
Artificial	301
Balance of trade	285-86
Benefit to the people	267-68
Coastwise ships	273, 275, 290
Commercial need	263-4, 270, 292, 295-6
Congestion in ports	283
Cost of ship building in U. S.	257, 269, 293, 295, 299
Cost of ship subsidy plan	266
Cunard Co. subsidy	298
Danger of war	289, 296
Danger of merchant marine to U. S.	306
Demands of trade	252
Duration of subsidy	268
Economically wrong	297, 301
Emergency	255, 256, 281, 303
Exports of United States	286
Foreign ships carry U. S. trade	294
Foreign ships discriminate against U. S. shippers	267
Government ownership of merchant marine.....	278-79, 309
Guarantee of ship mortgages	260, 278, 310
Indirect subsidy	250
Insurance	283
Interned ships	287
Kills invention and improved service	298-99
Lack of merchant marine	257
Market for surplus output	207
Merchant marine a weakness in war	290-91

	PAGE
Naval auxiliaries	251, 268, 273, 289, 291, 304
Need of merchant marine	250, 263-04, 270, 281, 285
Operation, cost of in U. S.	258, 269, 298
Plan of subsidy	259, 265, 276
Present carrying capacity	257
Rates	281
Rate increase	255, 298
Return cargoes	284
Risks of navigation	282
Scarcity of ships	255
Shipping board	262, 310
Subsidy graft	310
Trade follows the flag	292-93
Undemocratic	297
Unjust in administration	297
Wages in Europe and the U. S.	269, 300
SHORT BALLOT	Vol. II. 299. Vol. III. 7
Affirmative	Vol. II. 319, 326, 332
Negative	Vol. II. 337, 346, 354
Appointive system	332, 341, 348, 350
Bossism	324, 347
Cabinet plan for the state	333
Candidate's acquaintance with	321, 328
Democracy of	338
Education in government, deprives people of	340, 359
Efficiency of, in government	326
Experience of, in Kansas local government	344
—in Kentucky	349
—in New Jersey	355
—in New York	349, 355, 356
—in Pennsylvania	355
—in Philadelphia	349
—in Pittsburg	358
In county	334
In commission government	335
Long ballot, difficulty of	321
Minor offices under	327
Position on ticket	323
Responsibility under	330-I
Technical offices under	329
SINGLE TAX (see Tax on Rental Value of Land)	Vol. VI. 159
Affirmative	161, 167, 173
Negative	179, 185, 191
Bibliography	197
Ability to pay	180
Adequacy	176, 187

	PAGE
Assessing of present tax	174
Based on values created by society	165, 182
Confiscatory	188
Definition	162
Discourages speculation	170
Discriminates	183
Double taxation	168
Encourages industry	163
Exemptions	183, 192
Experience with	177, 193
False economically	185
Inequality of working	185-186
Inelastic	187
Issues	161, 179-180
Justice of	161, 181-182
Land monopoly discouraged	169
Mortgages and assessment	168
Practicability	185-186, 191
Present tax encourages dishonesty	175
Restriction of industry	163, 192
Shifting incidence	171
Social significance of	169-170, 171
Tax reforms	195
Tax collection	174
Tax upon wealth	164
Theory of	163, 180
Unearned increment	166
SIX-YEAR TERM FOR PRESIDENT	Vol. V. 401
Affirmative	401, 410
Negative	417, 425
Abuses of four year system	404
Appointees in politics	408-9
Bibliography	435
Civil service	415, 429
Comparison of plans	424
Dangerous in time of war	434
Deadlocks	423, 433
Efficiency of administration	414
Evils of	418, 432
Evils of present system	404-9, 418
Experience discredits	418, 419
Federal patronage	407-8, 414, 415, 421, 428
First election vs. re-election	413, 420, 423, 430-31
Grant	402-3
Historical sketch	401
Integrity of presidents	413

	PAGE
Issues	425, 426
Party government	402, 412, 421
Power of party machine	402, 408, 412
Preferential primary	416, 429
President forced to campaign for re-election.....	404, 407
President plays politics in present system.....	404-5
Re-election a check	419
Re-election and immigration question.....	405
Re-election and public opinion	407, 410-II
Re-election and the trusts	405, 412, 430
Renomination	407, 420
Restricts popular power	427
Roosevelt	403
Third term danger	411
Third term tradition	402-3, 411, 422
Too long and too short	433-434
SUFFRAGE, EDUCATIONAL	Vol. I. 243
Affirmative	243, 246, 249
Negative	250
and compulsory education	253
and illiterate voter	244
Bibliography	258
Class government	251, 252
Constitutionality	243, 244, 251, 252
Encourages education	244
Enfranchisement of the negro	248
Fallacy of educational test	257
Immigrant affected by	245
Raises standard of citizenship	246
Universal suffrage a political expedient	255
Voting power a right	254
TARIFF (see Raw Material, and Income Tax)	Vol. I. III. Vol. II. 149
Abandonment of protective	
Affirmative. Vol. I. III, 114, 116, 118. Vol. II. 149, 155, 160	
Negative.. Vol. I. 119, 120, 121, 122. Vol. II. 165, 171, 176	
Protective tariff	
and business	Vol. I. 113, 115, 120, 121
and cheap labor	Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 173, 191
and conservation	Vol. II. 159, 186, 227
and free trade	Vol. I. 115, 122, Vol. II. 168, 178
and high prices	Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 171, 197-8
and reciprocity	Vol. II. 177, 194
Bartering and log-rolling	Vol. II. 198
Benefit to the laborer	Vol. II. 162, 173, 175

	PAGE
—to the farmer	Vol. II. 163
Bibliography	Vol. I. 123. Vol. II. 181
Cause of foreign boycott	Vol. I. 112, 114. Vol. II. 161
Drives out capital	Vol. II. 192
English experience	Vol. I. 115-6
Fosters trusts	Vol. I. 116, 122. Vol. II. 158, 204
German experience	Vol. I. 115-6. Vol. II. 179
Has accomplished its purpose	Vol. I. 112. Vol. II. 151
Principle of protection	Vol. I. 118. Vol. II. 165
Promotes prosperity	Vol. I. 117. Vol. II. 167
Protected industries sell cheaper abroad	Vol. I. 118. Vol. II. 155, 191
Tariff board	Vol. II. 176
TAX	
Franchise tax, federal conservation	Vol. II. 264
Income tax (see Income)	Vol. II. 1, 24, 59, 89
Inheritance tax	Vol. I. 141
Affirmative	141
Negative	142
as revenue reform	142, 143
as social reform	141, 142
as state tax	143
Bibliography	143
Evils of inheritance	141
Necessity of	142
On rental value of land (Single Tax)	Vol. II. 127
Affirmative	127
Negative	128, 134, 140
Condemned by the Rhode Island tax commission	141
Definition	129
Inelastic	142
Not properly distributed	134
Is confiscation	139, 140
Taxation without consent of the taxed	143
Unjust to land owners	139, 142, 144
Value of land depends upon the community	135
Would depreciate value of land	137
Would disturb balance of property values	137
Would disturb commercial relations	139
Wrong in principle	133
Property tax	Vol. II. 13, 131
Assessment of	131
On tangible and intangible property	133
TAXATION	
Direct	4, 27, 110, 195
Indirect	19

	PAGE
Mill's theory	I
of corporations	14
Personality and property	13, 131
Principles of	I, 65, 66, 129
Say's theory	65, 66
Shifting the incidence	120, 189, 190, 263
TRUSTS (see under Regulation).	
UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE FOR STATES. Vol. V	283
Affirmative	283, 289, 297
Negative	302, 310, 317
Advantages of	306
Advisability of	321
Authorities on	300
Bibliography	323
Bicameral system	284
Business administration	300, 301
Canadian experience	299, 300
Caucus and machinery	292
Changes in bicameral system needed	319
Checks and balances	307, 322
Comparison	320
Committee system	314
Cumbersome (present system)	295
Danger of	308
Deadlock	296
Definition	283
Diversity of representation	307, 322
English experience	303
French experience	303
Hasty legislation	286, 287, 290, 298, 311, 322
Historical sketch bicameral system	302-3
Inefficiency	295
Inherent evils	318
Lack of responsibility	288, 294, 297, 314
Legislature's time limit	311-12
Legislative reference bureau	311, 319
Local legislation	313
Mass of legislation	312
Party system	290
Party machine	291
Plan of	297
Practicability	299
Present conditions	312-14
United States experience	303
WAGES (see Minimum Wage and Labor).	
WATER POWER	Vol. II. 245

Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. VII

EDITED BY EGBERT RAY NICHOLS
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS

CLOTH — \$1.65 postpaid — OCTAVO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.

1. The Swiss System of Compulsory Military Service.
 - a. Princeton vs. Harvard.
 - b. Princeton vs. Yale.
2. Exemption of Labor Unions from Anti-Trust Legislation.
 - a. Southwestern College (Kansas) vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.
 - b. Southwestern College vs. Kansas Wesleyan University.
3. City Manager Plan of Municipal Government.
 - a. South Dakota Wesleyan vs. Morningside Col.
 - b. St. Olaf College vs. Morningside College.
 - c. South Dakota Wesleyan vs. St. Olaf College.
 - d. Morningside College vs. So. Dakota Wesleyan.
4. Open Door Policy in China.
 - a. Kansas State Agricultural College vs. Kansas State Normal (Dual).
5. Socialistic Control of Production and Exchange.
 - a. Yankton College vs. South Dakota Wesleyan.
 - b. Huron College vs. Yankton College.
6. Increase in Army and Navy.
 - a. University of Southern California Law School vs. Columbia University.
7. Government Ownership of Interstate Railroads.
 - a. Southwestern College vs. Univer. of Redlands.

Appendix I. 1915-1916 Year Book of Intercollegiate Debates.

Appendix II. Record of Debate Questions 1915-1916.

Appendix III. Summary of Annual Debate Records 1910-1916.

Index to this Volume.

General Index, Volumes I to VII inclusive.

To Librarians

Intercollegiate Debates, Vols. I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VII are just the books which librarians need to put into the hands of the many who come for material on questions of the day. See the lists above of all the questions discussed.

Dictionaries : The Classic Series. *Half morocco.* Especially planned for students and teachers in colleges and high schools. Up to the times in point of contents, authoritative while modern as regards scholarship, instantly accessible in respect to arrangement, in a binding elegant and durable. 8x5½ in.

French-English and Eng.-French, 1122 pp. \$2.00.
German-English and Eng.-German, 1112 pp. \$2.00.
Latin-English and Eng.-Latin, 941 pages. \$2.00.
Greek-English and Eng.-Greek, 1056 pages. \$2.00.
English-Greek Dictionary. \$1.00.

Dictionaries : The Handy Series. *Pocket Edition.* Scholarship modern and accurate; beautiful print.

Spanish English and Eng.-Spanish, 474 pp. \$1.00.
Italian-English and Eng.-Italian, 428 pp. \$1.00.
New-Testament Lexicon. With a fine presentation of the Synonyms of the Greek Testament. \$1.00.

Liddell and Scott's Abridged Greek Lexicon. With new Appendix of Proper and Geog'l names. \$1.20.

White's Latin-English Dictionary. \$1.20.

White's English-Latin Dictionary. \$1.20.

White's Lat.-Eng. and Eng.-Lat. Diction. \$2.25.

International Pronouncing French-English and Eng.-French Dictionary. *Half morocco.* The pronunciation is indicated by a full re-spelling of each title-word in the system of the *International Phonetic Assoc'n*, a widely used means of indicating, simply and accurately, the pronunciation of all languages in a single (amplified) Roman alphabet. \$3.00.

Who's Who in Mythology? A dictionary of mythological characters. Identifies and locates instanter every god and goddess, hero and myth that are likely to be broached either in conversation, sermon, song, drama, painting or statuary. 75 cents.

Who's Who in History? A dictionary of classical characters and allusions. Locates the places, identifies the persons, describes the things, which are constantly alluded to in literature, in sermons, in paintings, in sculpture and in conversation. 75 cents

Entertainments for Every Occasion. Ideas, games charades, tricks, plans—for keeping those present entertained, on whatever occasion, whether a party, a festival, a bazaar, an entertainment, or merely "our own folks" or an "*entre nous*." \$1.25.

The Humorous Speaker. The choicest, most recent humor that lends itself to *recitation*. Easily the best collection that has been made. The selections are chosen because they are *good literature*, and because they are *good recitations*. Unhackneyed material—most of it from recently copyrighted books, for which *special permission* has been secured. A hundred and twenty-five selections, about 500 pages. \$1.25.

Commencement Parts. "Efforts" for all occasions. *Models* for every possible occasion in high-school and college career, every one of the "efforts" being what some fellow has *stood on his feet* and actually delivered on a similar occasion—not what the compiler *would* say if *he* should happen to be called on for an ivy song or a response to a toast, or what not; but what the fellow himself, when his turn came, *did say!* Invaluable, indispensable to those preparing any kind of "effort." *Unique.* \$1.50.

Contains *models* of the salutatory, the valedictory, orations, class poems, class songs, class mottos, class will, ivy poem and song, Dux's speech; essays and addresses for flag day, the seasons, national and other holidays; after-dinner speeches and responses to toasts. Also *models* for occasional addresses—social, educational, political, religious. Also *models* for *superintendents'* and *principals'* addresses to graduating class, debating team, educational conference; on dedication of school building, public building, library; for holidays, festival days, and scores of social and other occasions. Also themes for essays, and lists of *subjects* for orations, essays, toasts.

College Men's 3-Minute Declamations. Material with vitality in it for prize speaking. *14th edit.* \$1.00.

College Maids' 3-Minute Readings. Up-to-date recitations from living men and women. On the plan of the popular College Men's 3-minute Declamations, and on the same high plane. *Twelfth edition.* \$1.00.

Pieces for Prize Speaking Contests. *Volume I.* Over one hundred pieces that have *actually taken prizes* in prize speaking contests. *Successful.* \$1.25.

Pieces for Prize Speaking Contests. *Vol. II.* \$1.25

Pieces for Every Occasion. "Special days." \$1.25

Famous Poems Explained. (Barbe). \$1.00.

How to Attract and Hold an Audience. Every student in college or school, every lawyer, every teacher, every clergyman, every man or woman occupying an official position, every citizen and every youth who is likely ever to have occasion in committee, or in public, to enlist the interest, to attract and hold the attention of one or more hearers, and *convince* them —every person who ever has to, or is likely to have to “speak” to one or more listeners will find in our new book a clear, concise, *complete* handbook which will enable him to *succeed!* \$1.00.

Thorough, concise, methodical, replete with common sense, complete. In his logical method, in the crystal-like lucidity of his style, in his forceful, incisive, penetrating mastery of his subject, the author has at one bound placed himself on a plane with the very ablest teacher-authors of his day.

Fenno's Science and Art of Elocution. Standard. Probably the most successful of its kind. \$1.25.

The Power of Speech, How to Acquire It. \$1.25. A comprehensive system of vocal expression. Thorough and practical instruction in the use of the speaking voice, embracing deep breathing, articulation, modulation, emphasis and delivery; vocal coloring, interpretation of the written word, the conveying of thought by means of vocal expression, and the principles of oratory and dramatic art.

The Psychology of Public Speaking. A scientific treatment of the practical needs of the public speaker. A worth-while book. \$1.25.

How to Use the Voice in Reading and Speaking. By Ed. Amherst Ott, head of the School of Oratory, Drake University. Suitable for class work. \$1.25.

How to Gesture. E. A. Ott. New *illus.* edit. \$1.00.

Constitution of U. S. In English, German and French. *Paper*, 25c.; *cloth*, 50c.

Constitution of U. S., with Index (Thorpe's Pocket Edition), 35c.

Brief History of Civilization (Blackmar), \$1.25.

The Changing Values of English Speech. \$1.25.

The Worth of Words. (Bell). \$1.25.

The Religion of Beauty. (Bell). \$1.25.

Instantaneous Arbitrator. - *Howe's Parliamentary Usage.* In this book, by an ingenious visual arrangement, the chairman, the speaker, the member who next has the floor, or any one else, has before his eyes a complete view of every rule needed in the conduct of any meeting. All rules, all exceptions, every procedure instantly accessible. Everything in sight. Does not have to be carried in the hand to and from meeting, but slips easily into and out of the pocket. Exactly suited to women's clubs, too, being used and recommended by officers of the General Federation, and the W. C. T. U. 50 cents.

New Parliamentary Manual. By Edmond Palmer, member of the Chicago Bar. Improves upon other parliamentary works by determining the reasons, the logic of the rules. Again by arranging the rules according to their importance in simple sequence, any man or woman, any boy or girl, is enabled actually to conduct a meeting without uproar, without delays, without confusion, or even friction. 75 cents.

This Manual (75 cents), giving the reasons, along with Howe's Handbook (50 cents), giving all the rules at a glance by means of a clever bird's-eye device, together provide an absolutely complete and perfect equipment. The two books for ONE DOLLAR if ordered at one time.

How to Organize and Conduct a Meeting. 75c.

American Civics. Dwells sufficiently upon the historical development as well as the theory of our governmental institutions, but also treats adequately the actual workings of party organizations and party methods. Questions of present interest are introduced, and in many instances the arguments on both sides of questions still open to debate. \$1.00.

SOME OF THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

Municipal Home Rule	Municipal Ownership
Initiative and Referendum	Trial by Jury
The Machine	Women Suffrage
The Boss	Caucus and Nominating Conventions
Minority and Proportional Representation	Committee System
Civil Service Reform	The Panama Canal
The Railroad Problem	Our Insular Possessions
Ship Subsidies	

American Civics explains the government in New York State and New York City in a way to enable instructive comparisons of the contrasts and the similarities with other states; similarly the New England, the Southern, and the Western states.

Grady's Orations and Speeches

EDITED BY EDWIN DUBOIS SHURTER

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC SPEAKING IN THE UNIV. OF TEXAS

CLOTH — \$1.25 — OCTAVO

This volume contains the complete orations and speeches of Henry W. Grady, the gifted Southern orator, and includes the Temperance speech in defence of Prohibition in Atlanta which has not heretofore appeared in print except in a newspaper report, also his address on the "Solid South," given at the Augusta Exposition in Atlanta, November, 1887.

COMPLETE CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction: Grady as an Orator	1
The New South.....	7
A speech delivered at the banquet of the New England Society, New York, December 21, 1886.	
The South and Her Problems.....	23
An address at the Dallas, Texas, State Fair, October 26, 1887.	
The "Solid South".....	65
An address given at the Augusta Exposition, November, 1887.	
A Plea for Prohibition	98
A speech made during the Prohibition Cam- paign in Atlanta, November 17, 1887.	
Against Centralization	134
An oration delivered before the Literary So- cieties of the Univ. of Virginia, June 25, 1889.	
The Farmer and the Cities	158
Speech at Elberton, Georgia, June, 1889.	
The Race Problem in the South	192
A speech delivered at the annual banquet of the Boston Merchants' Association, Dec., 1889.	
Plymouth Rock and Democracy	221
A speech delivered before the Bay State Club, Boston, in 1889.	

PROS AND CONS

Price \$1.50 postpaid

Both Sides of Live Questions Fully Discussed

This book has stood the test of years and is still in demand. Besides the debates written out in full it contains chapters on How to Organize a Society and Rules for Governing Debates, also a list of Two Hundred and Fifty Questions for Debate.

Some of the Questions Discussed are:

Should Cuba Be Annexed to the United States?

Resolved, That the United States Should Adopt Penny Postage.

Should the Government of the United States Own and Control the Railroads?

Resolved, That Woman Suffrage Should Be Adopted by an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, That Tariff for Revenue Only is of Greater Benefit to the People of the United States than a Protective Tariff.

Resolved, That the Government of the United States Should Own and Control the Telephone and Telegraph Systems.

Is Immigration Detrimental to the United States?

Are Large Department Stores an Injury to the Country?

Should the President and Senate of the United States Be Elected by Direct Vote of the People?

Resolved, That Trusts and Monopolies are a Positive Injury to the People Financially.

Resolved, That Cities Should Own and Control All the Public Franchises Now Conferred Upon Corporations.

50 English Classics Briefly Outlined. Contains a brief analysis, *in outline*, of fifty of the masterpieces of our language, in the fields of the *drama*, *fiction*, *narrative poetry*, *lyric poetry*, *essays* and *addresses*, and covering many of the "College Entrance Requirements." **\$1.25.**

Most books of the sort are mere question books; this book gives you the *answers*, in just the shape you want them. The book is absolutely *unique*. There are no others like it.

How to Study Literature. A novel, a poem, a history, a biography, a drama, an oration, a sermon, or any other literary production, if read or studied as this book tells one how to read and study, becomes a subject which one can converse or write about in a thoroughly intelligent way. Contains lists of the right words to designate the author's style, quality or other characteristics. **75 cents.**

Enables you to *talk about* a book as if you had really *sized it up*. Just the thing for literary societies, reading circles, teacher, pupil; also for anyone who desires to retain a symmetrical impression of the books he reads. *Eight editions in five ten months.*

Handbook of Literary Criticism. (W. H. Sheran). Any fairly intelligent person who delves attentively in this *Handbook of Literary Criticism*, need never again be at a loss to express himself on literary matters, because it furnishes not merely the requisite knowledge of literature as such and of literature as an art, but also furnishes the very language, the very phrases, the very words themselves, which enable one to talk on literature and literary subjects with that familiarity and that facility which marks one as a cultivated person. **\$1.25.**

Just as our smaller book, Heydrick's *How to Study Literature* (75 cents postpaid) enables one to master any particular book so as to be able to discuss it intelligently (actually furnishing lists of the right words to describe the author's style and other characteristics and all the features of the book) so Sheran's *Literary Criticism* teaches the student how to approach literature in general so as to talk intelligently about literature in general.

Books I Have Read. An outline notebook. **25 cts.** A new device that makes possible the keeping of a *systematic, uniform, concise and complete record* of the books one reads.

Merchant of Venice Completely Outlined. **30c.**

Popular Patriotic Poems Explained. **65 cents.**

Speaking! Debating!

DECLAMATIONS, RECITATIONS, READING;
DIALOGUES, DEBATES, PRIZE SPEAKING, ORATIONS,
FOR ALL OCCASIONS

Cloth unless otherwise indicated

Acme Declamation Book (<i>some Dialogues</i>) .. (paper 30c.)	\$0.50
Approved Selections (1 vol. for each Grade, 1 to 8)*..each	.25
Best American Orations of To-Day (<i>Blackstone</i>).....	1.25
College Girls' Three Minute Readings (<i>Davis</i>).....	1.00
College Men's Three Minute Declamations (<i>Davis</i>).....	1.00
Commencement Parts. (Orations, Essays; Class Day and "After Dinner" Efforts). <i>Efforts for all occasions</i> (<i>Davis</i>)	1.50
Famous Poems Explained (<i>Barbe</i>).....	1.00
Great Poems Interpreted (<i>Barbe</i>).....	1.25
Patriotic Poems Explained (<i>Murphy</i>).....	.65
The Patriotic Speaker (<i>Brownlee</i>) ..	1.25
Handy Pieces to Speak (<i>on separate cards</i>), <i>Pry.</i> , <i>Intermed.</i> , <i>Advanced</i> , (<i>contains some Dialogues</i>) ..	.50
Humorous Speaker, <i>The</i>	1.25
Model Speaker, <i>The</i> (<i>Lawrence</i>)*.....	1.10
Modern American Speaker, <i>The</i> (<i>Shurter</i>).....	1.25
Most Popular Selections (<i>Pearson's "The Speaker Series."</i>) Send for descriptive list. 32 nos. (pap. ea. 40c.) cloth, ea.	.60
New Dialogues and Plays for Children, Ages 5 to 10, (pap.)	.50
New Dialogues and Plays for Children, Ages 10 to 15, (pap.)	.50
New Dialogues and Plays for Ages 15 to 25, (paper).....	.50
(The above three books <i>in one volume</i>).....cloth	1.50
Pieces for <i>Every Occasion</i> (<i>Le Row</i>).....	1.25
Pieces That Have Taken Prizes in Speaking Contests (<i>Craig</i>)	1.25
New Pieces That Will Take Prizes " (" <i>Blackstone</i>)	1.25
Selected Readings from the Most Popular Novels (<i>Lewis</i>). ..	1.25
Southern Speaker, <i>The</i> (<i>Ross</i>).....	1.00
<hr/>	
Entertainments for Every Occasion.....	1.25
Both Sides of 100 Public Questions Briefly Debated.....	1.25
Pros and Cons: <i>Complete Debates</i> (<i>Craig</i>).....	1.50
Intercollegiate Debates, <i>Vols. I, II, III, IV, V,</i> ..each	1.50
250 New Questions for Debates (paper).....	.15
How to Organize and Conduct a Meeting (<i>Henry</i>).....	.75
Handbook of Parl'y Usage: <i>Instantaneous Arbitrator</i> (<i>Howe</i>)	.50
New Parliamentary Manual (<i>Palmer</i>).....	.75
<hr/>	
How to Appreciate the Drama (<i>Marble</i>).....	1.25
Well Planned Course in Reading, A (<i>Le Row</i>)*.....	1.00
Ten Weeks' Course in Elocution, A (<i>Coombs</i>)*.....	1.25
Essential Steps in Reading and Speaking (<i>Fox</i>).....	1.50
Manual of Elocution and Reading (<i>Brooks</i>)*.....	1.10
New Science and Art of Elocution (<i>Fenno</i>)*.....	1.25
Extemporaneous Speaking (<i>Pearson and Hicks</i>).....	1.25
The Power of Speech (<i>Lawrence</i>)*.....	1.25
How to Use the Voice in Reading and Speaking (<i>Ott</i>)*.....	1.25
How to Gesture. <i>Illustrated.</i> (<i>Ott</i>)*.....	1.00
How to Attract and Hold an Audience (<i>Esenwein</i>)*.....	1.00
Psychology of Public Speaking (<i>Scott</i>)*.....	1.25

Contents of any of the above books on request

How to Appreciate THE DRAMA

By THOMAS LITTLEFIELD MARBLE

ILLUSTRATED — \$1.25, postpaid — CLOTH, GILT TOP

A book designed for lovers of the drama in general, for dramatic societies, for the study sections of reading clubs, as well as for classes in schools and colleges.

The subject is treated from the standpoint of practical dramaturgy, the desire of the author being to point out the fundamental principles which underlie sound dramatic art — the ultimate purpose being to enable those who are yet inexperienced in recognizing and appraising the intrinsic values of plays, to learn to do so in a manner reasonably authoritative.

The book contains an *analytical diagram*, suggestive *analyses* of four classical plays, and the full text, with *marginal annotations*, of "The Cricket on the Hearth," the *Screen Scene* from "The School for Scandal," and the *Trial Scene* from "The Merchant of Venice." These annotated plays are an *open sesame*.

Without attempting to decide the moot question whether the drama should be treated as a branch of literature or as an independent subject, the author shows his readers *how to appreciate* a well constructed play quite apart from its purely literary value and its technique. To appraise a play, to "appreciate" it — the author hopes that an attentive perusal of this book will put one in the way of doing just that.

Teachers who have directed student productions of such of Mr. Marble's comedies as "*A Royal Runaway*," and "*Won by Wireless*," and "*The Wooing of Wilhelmina*" will welcome the opportunity to place this work in the hands of their pupils, whose interest cannot fail to be stimulated by the fact that they have actually performed plays written by its author.

Embellished by Portraits of 28 Playwrights and Actors

The medallion embossed upon the cover of the book is the device of THE DRAMA SOCIETY and is used by permission.

Sheran's Handbook of Literary Criticism, \$1.25
50 English Classics Briefly Outlined, \$1.25
Great Poems Interpreted, \$1.25

The Speaker Series

The Speaker Series (82 vols.) paper, 40c.; cloth, 60c.

- No. 1 Popular Short Stories
- No. 2 Selections Chosen for Declamation Contests
- No. 3 Selections for Children to Recite
- No. 4 Cuttings from Stories
- No. 5 Cuttings from Stories
- No. 6 Ten Short Plays
- No. 7 Readings, and Four Plays
- No. 8 Briefs of Debates, and Readings
- No. 9 Cuttings of Popular Stories
- No. 10 Modern American Oratory
- No. 11 Dramatic and Humorous Readings
- No. 12 Centennial Number
- No. 13 New Platform Selections
- No. 14 Selections for Religious Occasions
- No. 15 Encores: Nearly 200 Fresh, Bright Hits
- No. 16 Popular Platform Readings
- No. 17 Humorous and Dramatic Readings
- No. 18 Monologues
- No. 19 On Temperance
- No. 20 For Declamation Contests
- No. 21 After-dinner Speaking
- No. 22 School and College Readings
- No. 23 Selections for Entertainments
- No. 24 Dramatic Selections
- No. 25 Popular Prose and Poetry
- No. 26 Readings from Great Authors
- No. 27 Readings and Debates Not Found Elsewhere
- No. 28 Classic Masterpieces
- No. 29 Best Fiction for the Platform
- No. 30 Humorous and Pathetic Readings
- No. 31 Patriotic Selections
- No. 32 Scenes from Plays for Platform Readings

THE ABOVE NUMBERS IN EIGHT BOUND VOLUMES,
indexed by authors and titles:

Vol. I.	Including Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4,	1 50
Vol. II.	Including Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8,	1 50
Vol. III.	Including Nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12,	1 50
Vol. IV.	Including Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 16,	1 50
Vol. V.	Including Nos. 17, 18, 19, 20,	1 50
Vol. VI.	Including Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24,	1 50
Vol. VII.	Including Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28,	1 50
Vol. VIII.	Including Nos. 29, 30, 31, 32,	1 50

*The numbers described in this folder are illustrative
of the series. A complete Index arranged by authors and
titles will be sent on request.*

QUESTIONS DISCUSSED

IN

"THE SPEAKER SERIES"

PAPER, 40 cents — CLOTH, 60 cents

The figure after the title indicates number of "The Speaker" in which the debate may be found.

Abandonment of Protective Tariff	15
American Imperialism	13
Armed Intervention for the Collection of Debts	8
Commission System of Municipal Government	12
Conservation of National Resources	23
Direct Primary	21
Employers' Liability for Accidents	11
Federal and State Government	8
Federal Charter for Interstate Business	12
Fifteenth Amendment	13
Government by Injunction	13
Government Control of Monopolies	27
Greek-Letter Fraternities	27
Income Tax	19
Income Tax	11
Inheritance Tax	8
Initiative and Referendum	11
Initiative and Referendum	24
Intercollegiate Athletics	27
Municipal Ownership	8
Open Shop	8
Presidential System <i>vs.</i> Parliamentary System	14
Programs of Declamation and Oratorical Contests	8
Railroad Pooling	9
Recall of Judges	27
Reciprocity with Canada	9
Santo Domingo Treaty	8
Single Tax	28

Both Sides of 100 Public Questions Briefly Debated

BY

**EDWIN DUBOIS SHURTER AND CARL CLEVELAND TAYLOR
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS**

CLOTH — \$1.25 postpaid — OCTAVO

This volume is intended as a handbook for debaters and for all those interested in literary or debating societies. The one hundred questions for debate are all on present-day subjects and, for the most part, have been tried out by the authors in class work. Under each question are given the main lines of argument, affirmative and negative. These arguments are stated in distinct, concise propositions (usually four each) which cover the issues in the question and which, if proved, will establish the case on one side or the other, the detailed proof of each proposition being left to the individual debater to work out. The arguments on each side are followed by references, selected for the definite purpose of substantiating the proposition as stated.

The following are a few of the questions discussed:

- Are Labor Organizations Beneficial ?**
- Equal Suffrage**
- Retention of the Philippines**
- Government Ownership of Railroads**
- National Railway Arbitration Board**
- Employers' Liability for Accident**
- An International Arbitration Court**
- Abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine**
- Disarmament of Nations**
- Restriction of Foreign Immigration**
- The Annexation of Mexico**
- Federal Control of Natural Resources**
- Free Trade for the United States**
- Child Labor**
- Socialism and the Labor Problem**
- Maintenance of an Increased Navy**
- Commission Plan of City Government**
- Fortification of Panama Canal**

Great Poems Interpreted

HELPERS TO READING WITH THE UNDERSTANDING

By WAITMAN BARBE, A. M., LITT. D.

CLOTH—\$1.25 Postpaid—375 PAGES

This is a book for all who want to know, or need to know, the real meaning and significance of some of the great English and American poems—a book for use in high schools and colleges, in teachers' reading circles and in literary clubs. It is an *explanatory course* in the study of *great poetry* from *Herrick* to *Rossetti*.

All who are acquainted with the author's *Famous Poems Explained* (see description, over) will welcome this new and more advanced volume. With scholarly instinct and training (including graduate work at both Harvard and Oxford), the author has rendered his fellow-students and fellow-teachers genuine service in this work of love.

A brief explanatory essay, by way of literary interpretation and historical setting, precedes each poem. Also, most of the poems are outlined for the convenience of teachers and students. Besides, the textual difficulties are explained in footnotes. At the end of the book are "*biographical notes* of the authors represented."

The Worth of Words, (Bell) \$1.25
The Changing Values of English Speech, (Bell) \$1.25
50 English Classics Briefly Outlined, (Hix) \$1.25
Handbook of Literary Criticism, (Sheran) \$1.25

Famous Poems Explained

HELPS TO READING WITH THE UNDERSTANDING

By WAITMAN BARBE, A. M., LITT. D.

CLOTH—\$1.00 Postpaid—TWELVEMO

Everyone has some favorite poem. Many have many which they declare their favorites. But everyone is familiar with many poems without being acquainted with them. Most of us are attracted in the case of many popular poems, by some one engaging quality of the verse, the rhythm, the swing or lilt, the sentiment, the sound—the way the words, the syllables, the metre fit the ideas—or it may be the story or the reminiscence, or some other attribute of the poem; or, again, it may be a patriotic or romantic association.

But for whatever reason a poem becomes one of our favorites, the more we know about the poem and about the allusions it contains, the better we appreciate it; and the more capable we become of appreciating other poems—the more susceptible we become to the charms of poetry generally.

To read with understanding—the design of the new book is to help one to do just that. And every one of the poems is prefaced interestingly by some account of the poem, or some incident regarding its origin, or something informing by way of interpretation or “appreciation.” In most instances the poem is followed by footnotes explanatory of words or phrases, or allusions; and at the end of the volume are “*Biographical Notes of the Authors Represented*.”

This book is suited to *elementary* study. The same author’s “*Great Poems Interpreted*” (see description, over) is suited to more advanced study.

The Worth of Words, (Bell) \$1.25
The Changing Values of English Speech, (Bell) \$1.25
50 English Classics Briefly Outlined, (Hix) \$1.25
Handbook of Literary Criticism, (Sheran) \$1.25

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



101 673

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY